AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

NEW SERIES—VOL. IV.—(XIV.)—MAY, 1896.—NO. 5.

THE GRADUAL PSALMS.

ONE of the noteworthy events in the history of recent Biblical criticism has been the publication of Professor Wellhausen's critical edition of the Hebrew text of the Book of Psalms.[1] A scholarly edition of this most interesting book has long been desired. The Psalter, considered as a whole, is indeed more free from textual corruptions than almost any other book in the Old Testament, yet some verses needed reconstruction, and many words correction. This has been done to a limited extent by Professor Wellhausen. Few, if any, arbitrary changes have been made, the readings adopted having been generally derived either from the Septuagint, Syriac or Vulgate Versions. The notes are hardly satisfying. They are meagre, and, as Professor Cheyne wrote in the *Academy*, do not indicate sufficiently the conclusions arrived at by the large number of eminent scholars who have done very much to make many obscure passages in the Psalter clear and intelligible.

This absence of needed notes is felt in a special manner when the collection of connected songs in the fifth book is to be examined. It has for a long time occupied the attention of critics, and although many strange and forced as well as plausible interpretations have in the past been given

1 Part 14 of "The Sacred Books of the Old Testament" under the editorial direction of Prof. Paul Haupt.

forth, yet some new light has been thrown upon it since the time of Olshausen.

The Songs of Degrees or Gradual Canticles are, historically viewed, the most important, and poetically, the most interesting part of the Fifth Book of the Psalter. From a very early date they have occupied a prominent place in the services of both the Jewish and Christian Churches. During the winter months on every Sabbath afternoon the entire group of fifteen psalms is said. And, according to later Jewish writers, at the feast of Tabernacles, or Arbours, as it is sometimes called, when the people came in from the neighboring provinces, and Jerusalem bore the appearance of a city of flowers, the Levites,[1] standing upon the fifteen steps that led from the Women's Court to the Court of Israel, sang the songs accompanied by the music of the cymbal, the psalter, and the harp.[2]

The Christian Church also has adopted the Songs of Degrees in her liturgies. "So varied are the doctrines contained in them, so useful are they, and set forth with such marvelous sweetness and elegance and brevity, that the Church has commanded them to be assiduously read and in choir chanted, in order that everyone might become familiar with them."[3] In the primitive Church the singing of psalms had an important part in divine worship; and, if we may draw the inference from the Roman Breviary which has preserved so many ancient traditions, the Songs of Degrees were made use of more frequently than any other in the Psalter. They have formed from an early time the *ferial* Vesper service; day after day all the year round a Gradual Psalm terminated Complin; and the night prayer of nearly every Christian has been the De Profundis. Parts of this collection of psalms were used also in blessings, and other forms of prayer, and made up almost the entire Officium Parvum of the Blessed Virgin. In the Greek Church "they are said or sung from September to Christmas. They are also said

1 Armfield: The Gradual Psalms.
2 Schurer: Hist. of Jews, Vol. I.
3 Pole: Synop. Crit. Scripturae Interpret. (1684,) Vol. II.

or sung in the Russian Church during the special services for Thursday in the first week of Lent."[1]

The title[2] prefixed to these psalms (cxx–cxxxv) has often been examined by critics. The old Latin Version and the Vulgate have "Canticum Graduum;" whence their common name of Gradual Psalms. In the Septuagint every psalm of this collection begins: Ὠδὴ τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν. The sense, however, is obscure. The Syriac version interprets the title: The Psalms of the Ascent from Babylon; and the Targum, basing its assertion upon a popular legend, explains it as:[3] שירא דאתאמר על נסוקין. It is plain that no certain knowledge on this subject can be acquired from the Versions. In consequence, various opinions have been held by scholars. This diversity of opinion has arisen from the uncommon substantive מעלות. The stem from which it is derived means to go up, to ascend; and hence the most obvious meaning of the plural substantive form is: goings up, ascents. When, however, this word is placed in connection with שיר the interpretation to be given to it is not immediately apparent. Aben Ezra held that the word then meant a certain kind of rising and falling music to which the songs were sung, and Rabbi Qimchi that the meaning is not ascent, but end, because at the termination of the sacred services the people were dismissed when the psalms were sung. Later Jewish writers render it:[4] the Song of the Steps,[5] from a misinterpretation of a passage in Talm. Bab., Succa, 51b.[6] Ewald, in his "Poetical Books of the Old Covenant," following the explanation of the Syriac Version, and of many of the Fathers, translated it: Songs of the Pilgrimages; and maintained that this collection of psalms was composed of old and new traveling songs sung by those who were

1 S. C. Malan, quoted by Armfield, o. c.

2 שיר המעלות.

3 "The songs that were spoken upon the steps (of the abyss)."

4 According to Card. Bellarmine, St. Augustine also held this opinion. Com. ad Psal. cxix.

5 Graetz.

6 Delitzsch: Psalms, Vol. iii. Cheyne: Orig. of Psal. p. 59.

returning from the exile. Eichhorn, Hengstenberg, Keil and Ewald, in the second edition of the work referred to, considered that the songs were sung by the people going up to Jerusalem to attend the three great festivals. Thenius understood מעלות as referring to the stations along the road to the Holy City. Gesenius,[1] followed by Delitzsch,[2] "taught that the fifteen psalms derived their name from the step-like rythm of their thoughts, and that, consequently, the name, like triolet (rounded) in western poetics, does not refer to the liturgical usage, but to the technical structure. The songs are called Songs of Degrees as being songs that move onwards climactically, and that, too, by means of πλοκή (ἐπιπλοκή) in Latin anastrophe, to use the terminology of rhetoric, *i. e.*, by means of the resumption of the immediately preceding word; and they are so placed because of this common characteristic . . ."

But all these explanations are unsatisfactory. The Jewish view, according to Olshausen, quoted by Wellhausen,[3] "must be rejected as untenable for external as well as internal reasons. The explanation of Gesenius . . . is equally improbable. So much is certain that this supposed peculiarity is by no means common to all the songs, and, moreover, that it reappears quite frequently in poems not in this collection." The idea implied in "Pilgrim Songs" is inferred from Psalm cxxi, i, and arises from a misconception of the real force of the title. From a grammatical point of view as well as exegetical, the meaning of the title prefixed to the Psalms is the one which has been adopted by Prof. Haupt:[4] Songs of the Ascent, or, as is suggested by Ezra vii, 9, Songs of the Return. Prof. Haupt has indicated that the plural does not refer to various ascents, but should be rendered according to a peculiar Semitic construction,[5] as if it were שירי המעלות after the analogy of בית האבות. The title, therefore,

1 Hallesche Literatur-Zeitung, 1812. 2 Del. o. c. p. 259.
3 Note on Ps. cxx. 4 Hebraica, Vol. II, Jan., 1886.
5 Gesenius–Mitchell: Heb. Gram. sec. 124, 2. J. H. U. Circ. Jul. '94. Profs. Cheyne and Robertson Smith explain the title correctly; but adopt the meaning: Pilgrim Songs.

belongs to the collection and not to any member in particular; thus it indicates also the period of Jewish history in which the fifteen songs belong.

The "Return" can mean no other than the return from captivity in Babylon. The position of the Songs in the fifth book of the Psalter, the liturgical additions characteristic of the hymns sung in the services of the Second Temple preclude the possibility of a pre-Exilic date; and the references to incidents narrated by Zechariah and Haggai, and by Ezra and Nehemiah, indicate plainly that the Songs were composed after the decree of Cyrus (536).[1]

During the years that had elapsed from the time of Nebuchadnezzar to the capture of Babylon by the Persians, the Jews had established themselves as flourishing and wealthy communities in the capital and the principal cities of the Empire. They entered actively into the commercial affairs of the peoples among whom they lived, and soon, although they were foreigners and captives, acquired an influential position. But as in all communities, so among the Jews also, many were poor; and others were still filled with love for their native land and longed to look upon its holy hills, and dwell within the ancient city of their fathers. The decree of Cyrus, therefore, stirred up very different emotions among those for whose benefit it had been promulgated.

The wealthy classes preferred to remain where all their interests were centered; then the Holy City was a long distance away, a city no more, a heap of ruins only; a dreary desert intervened, a desert inhabited by wild marauding tribes; the chances of succeeding were doubtful, and, in consequence, many were sceptical as to the outcome. They looked indeed toward the mountains of Zion; but whence would come their help to go to them?[2] Still, there were some who listened to the call of their ruler. They were for

1 For an explanation of the title לדוד prefixed to Ps cxxii, cxxiv, cxxxi, cxxxiii, and of לשלמה, Ps. cxxvii, cf. Driver; Introd. to the Lit of the O. T.; Vigouroux: Manuel Bib, Vol. II, p. 244.

2 Ps. cxxi.

the most part from the poorer class, although the son of Shealthiel, Zerubbabel, and a few other chiefs of celebrated families were among them. A universal cry of joy, however, went up from all. The harp that had hung soundless by the waters of Babylon was seized, and gave forth its music again :

> Like a bird have our lives escaped from the net of the fowler,
> The net has been broken, and we have escaped.[1]

Those then who had resolved to go, went forth from Babylon, praising Jahveh, who had delivered them from their foes, from the mighty torrent that had seemed about to roll over them,[2] and blessing the Lord because He had not forgotten His people.

The desert across which they had to go was dreary enough and dangerous to make the Israelites fearful.[3] Then, as now, it "was infested by bands of Bedouins, who, combining for the purpose of plunder, leave their tents in the Syrian plain, and undertake journeys of two or three months merely to intercept and plunder caravans."[4] There were no towering mountains to relieve the sight, only here and there walled stations, and occasional wells of water, while beneath their feet, if they traveled in the spring time, was the close desert shrubbery which soon withered and left the hard gravel-covered land bare. However, they were returning home, and went forth bravely into the desert, encouraging one another with the beautiful words :

> Jahveh is thy guardian, Jahveh is thy shelter upon thy right hand.
> By day the sun shall not smite thee, nor the moon by night.
> Jahveh shall protect thee from every danger;
> He shall save thy life.[5]

After the long and weary march across the desert, the condition of the Jews was deplorable. The majority of them had been poor in Babylonia; but now they were almost

1 Ps. cxxiv. 2 Ps. cxxiv.

3 Ezra viii. 21. 4 Layard : Nineveh and Babylon.

5 Ps. cxxi. It seems to me somewhat probable that verses 5–7 of Ps. cxxi were composed by the musicians accompanying the returning Israelites, during the journey across the desert, and were added to the preceding verses by a late redactor, who appended the liturgical verse 8.

destitute. Their misery was increased by the drought which afflicted the land. Corn and vines had been planted, but the earth did not yield to the labor bestowed upon it.[1] The seed was scattered about in the long furrows,[2] but the green shoots did not spring forth. In looking back over the past, when they were filled with joy at the news of the decree of Cyrus, and even over the toilsome desert journey when, although tired out, hope prompted them to sing songs of gladness, and compared those times with the present, it seemed as if they had been dreaming,[3] and now were awake and in sorrow. But the Jewish people had suffered too much in the past to lose courage soon. A prophet[4] was in their midst, and he aroused them. It was no time for them to mourn over their own troubles, no time to think of themselves, sitting idle in their houses while the house of God was not built.[5] Stirred up by him who had wept over the ruins of the stately Temple of Solomon, the building of the second Temple began, and in 516 was finished. The once powerful nation, humbled now and few in number, assembled to dedicate the new House of Jahveh. All the Jews around Jerusalem went there, for the joyous news had been heard in the fertile fields and in the forests.[6] The desire of Zerubbabel was attained now. The House of the Lord was standing again. A great enthusiasm and hope filled all. Dreams of an independent king were entertained; and in the minds of all, Zerubbabel was to be king. "The Lord of Hosts has solemnly declared, O Zerubbabel, son of Shealthiel, I will take thee, Jahveh has solemnly declared, and I will make thee like a signet; for thee have I chosen, saith the Lord of Hosts."[7] Around his head the Messianic hopes of the nation played.[8] It is not strange, then, that the Chasidim sang:

1 Haggai i, 1–11. 2 Ps. cxxvi.

3 Ps. cxxvi. 4 Haggai ii, 19. 5 Ibid i, 4.

6 Ps. cxxxii, 6; although cf. 2 Chron. vi, 41–42.

7 Haggai ii, 23. 8 Cheyne; Origin of the Psalter, lec. ii.

Jahveh has sworn by David a truth,
And he will not turn from it;
Thy children I will place upon thy throne;
And if thy children keep my covenant
And my law which I will teach them;
Their children also
Shall sit upon thy throne forever.[1]

Even to this day the olden Jewish prince "stands forth in history as the example of the sure success of a lofty purpose, secured by the reverse of the Fabian policy—not by prudently waiting for results, but by boldly acting at the moment."[2] And after times have seen in the song sung in his honor a Messianic strain foretelling the everlasting rule of one greater than Zerubbabel.

Although the Lord seemed now to have returned to Zion, and the mountain of the Lord a holy mount, still the sceptre of the stranger was strong; and as time went on the hopes of independence faded away. Distress and poverty increased among the people. The provisions of Jerusalem were still unblessed, and her poor had not sufficient food. Then, too, the Samaritans who had been refused permission to assist in building the Temple,[3] were endeavoring to break up the new settlement. Its position was critical, and with difficulty did it succeed in securing protection.[4] But during those dark years of trouble and suffering that intervened between the governorship of Zechariah and Nehemiah, trust in Jahveh had not been lost. The mournful though trustful songs of the minstrels place vividly before us the thoughts of the Israelites:

Those trusting in Jahveh are like Mount Zion
Which is not shaken, which stands forever.

—

The sceptre of the ungodly shall not rest[5]
Upon the lot of the righteous.[6]

1 Ps. cxxxii, 11–12. 2 Stanley: Lect. on the Jewish Church, lec. 43.

3 Ezra iv, 3 4 Rawlinson: Ezra and Neh., p. 19.

5 Wellhausen has יָנִיחַ following the LXX with Jahveh as subject.

6 Ps. cxxv; although cf. Cheyne: Orig. of the Psalter, p. 54.

In the earlier years of Nehemiah the opposition of the Samaritans was very great. They were continually endeavoring to prevent the rebuilding of the walls and strengthening of the city. From the time when Israel was in bondage, affliction seemed hovering round always; and now, when trodden down by all there was no respite.[1] Contempt and ridicule were heaped upon the weary builders of the walls.[2] "Even that which they build, if a fox go up he shall even break down their walls."

As the building went on, the enemies of Jerusalem sent letters containing false charges[3] to the king, and although Israel could call upon the Lord to witness that the hope of rising again as an independent nation had died out,[4] yet the prospect for a while was dark. The deceitful tongue of the Samaritans seemed successful for a time. Peace was longed for by the Jews; but as soon as they endeavored to build themselves a city and a home, their enemies cried out against them.[5] They were in the depths of trouble.[6] Many were discouraged and weary from the long continuous work day and night[7], and incited by the nobles[8], complained of the excessive labors imposed on them by Nehemiah. A stricter party, too, arose and opposed the governor. Walls were not needed, but trustfulness in Jahveh; without the help of the Lord all labor is vain; those who serve Him, even though they labor not, shall receive abundantly.[9] This, however, was a passing phase only. The walls and towers and houses were built. Jews from the neighboring villages were induced to make their home in Jerusalem, and it became again a

1 Ps. cxxix. 2 Neh. iv, 4; Ps cxxiii. 3 Neh. vi. 5; Ps. cxxxi.

4 Neh. vi, 8–9. 5 Ps. cxx. 6 Neh. iv, 7; Ps. cxxx.

7 Ps. cxxxiv may have been sung by those guarding the walls at night.

8 Neh. iii, 5.

9 Ps. cxxvii. Although according to Graetz, Haupt and Cheyne this beautiful song was written by some one not in sympathy with Nehemiah, yet it was incorporated into the Psalter on account of the deep spiritual meaning contained within it.

compact town.[1] Above all the Temple stood. The priests and Levites, arrayed in their holy vestments, daily offered to God sacrifices according to the ancient traditions. The dark cloud which had cast a gloom upon the City was fading away. The Lord was dwelling with His people again.

> I rejoice with those who say to me
> Let us enter into the house of the Lord.
> Our feet are standing again
> In thy gates, O Jerusalem;
> Jerusalem which is built like a city
> Closely compacted together.[2]

Thus the Gradual Psalms are truly historical songs. In the arrangement of them,[3] which, with the exception of the new interpretation I have given of Ps. cxxi, and the position of Ps. cxxii, has been adopted from the chronological order of the Songs of the Return suggested by Prof. Haupt, the allusions to the events of the time are clearly seen. Those were years filled with anxieties and sufferings, as well as with hope, for the returned Israelites. At times the future seemed gloomier than the present. The nations around were hostile; Nature herself was ungrateful for awhile; everything was desolate and dreary, and the lamentations of those who had seen the olden city in all its beauty, and remembered the marvelous Temple of Solomon added to the general feeling of despondency. The Songs of the Return reflect these varied emotions. They are a mirror of the fluctuating fortunes and feelings of Israel.[4] "Their freshness, their brilliant color, their allusions, their reflection of the homely phrase and surrounding of the folk, show them to have no other author than the mouth of the people."[5] Israel had always been a

1 Neh. xi, 1; Ps. cxxxiii.

2 Ps. cxxii; I call the attention of those who are interested in the revision of the Vulgate to "cuius participatio eius in idipsum," "filii excussorum" of Ps. cxxvi: and of "obligationes" in Ps. cxxiv.

3 The Psalms were arranged originally for practical purposes, and for the purpose of teaching moral lessons; not chronologically.

4 Cheyne: o. c. p. 55.

5 Murray: Orig. and Growth of Ps.

lover of song. The music of the cymbal and the harp had ever found an echo in the Jewish heart. We can easily believe, then, that these ballads helped to make life happier and less hard to bear. For the modern world, also, apart from their historical value, they are priceless. They manifest the great truths that should regulate life, and their lessons of trustfulness, when deeply impressed on the mind, seem to bring God nearer and make the heart His very sanctuary. As Card. Bellarmine said long ago: "Certe Psalmi (isti) sunt pleni affectibus in Deum, et proprii eorum, qui se peregrinos, atque exules, in terra inimicorum intelligunt, et nunc aerumnas exilii deflent, nunc ad requiem patriae suspirant; semper autem se ad ascendendum, et in via Domini proficiendum accendunt." [1]

ENEAS B. GOODWIN, B. D.,
Fellow of Johns Hopkins University.

Johns Hopkins University,
Baltimore, Md.

1 Com. ad Ps. cix.

THE UNION OF THE CHURCHES.

CONCLUSION OF THE REJOINDER TO THE GREEK PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

XXI.

IN the *Patriarchal and Synodical Encyclical*, which we have discussed in the preceding articles, we find a declaration which reflects honor on the Patriarch and the twelve Bishops who have subscribed to that important document. It is as follows: "In order to promote this sacred purpose of union, the Oriental orthodox and Catholic Church of Christ is willing to cordially accept any changes or observances which she does not perchance admit, provided it can be shown that these changes and observances were unanimously received by the Eastern and Western Churches previous to the ninth century."

Such language is encouraging and leads us readily to undertake the examination of the actual and principal issue of that lamentable separation which the Patriarch, it would seem, regrets no less than Leo XIII himself. That issue culminated, as is well known, in the primacy of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff over the entire Church. Leo XIII expressly states in his Apostolic letter: *Praecipuum dissidii caput est de Romani Pontificis primatu*, and the Patriarch confirms it in his Encyclical, in which, leaving out of sight all minor points, he purposely and diffusely treats of this theme only.

If the aforesaid declaration is sincere, our duty is clear and defined. The illustrious Patriarch "will accept with his whole soul" the doctrine of the primacy which he now denies, if only it be proven to him that "it was unanimously professed before the ninth century by the Eastern and Western

[1] *Καὶ δὴ ἐπὶ τῷ ἱερῷ σκοπῷ τῆς ἑνώσεων ἡ ἀνατολικὴ ὀρθόδοξος καὶ καθολικὴ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησία ἐστὶν ἑτοίμη ἀποδέξασθαι ὁλοψύχως, εἰ τυχὸν παρέφθειρεν ἢ μὴ κατέχοι, πᾶν, ὅτι πρὸ τοῦ ἐνάτου αἰῶνος ὁμολόγουν ὁμοφώνως ἥ τε Ἀνατολικὴ καὶ ἡ Δυτικὴ Ἐκκλησία.*—*Litterae Encyclicae*, § 6.

Churches." Leo XIII in his appeal to the Oriental Churches suggests this proof for their thoughtful examination: "Respiciant ad initia, videant quid maiores senserint sui, quid proxima originibus aetas tradiderit. Inde enimvero illud Christi divinum testimonium, *Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam*, luculenter exstat de Romanis Pontificibus comprobatum."

Let us briefly develop this proof and at the same time endeavor to solve the difficulties which the Patriarch makes against it. In the first place we have the Scriptural text of the Gospel according to St. Matthew.[1] In it we find related the discourse which Christ addressed to St. Peter in answer to the sublime confession which the latter made of Christ's divinity: *Blessed art thou, Simon, son of John; because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say to thee: that thou art a rock;*[2] *and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven.*

And here it will be well to note two very important particu-

1 Matt. XVI, 17–19.

2 We have translated *a rock* and not *Peter* because Christ spoke not in Greek or in Latin, but in Syro-Chaldaic and because this Gospel was written by St. Matthew in Syro-Chaldaic, or rather Aramaic. Now *Kepha* in the Chaldaic and *Kïpho* in the Syriac, the word used by Christ, signifies *a rock*. Hence St. Jerome in Chapt. 2 of his first book on the Epistle to the Galatians says: *Modo Cephas et modo Petrus scribitur, non quod aliud significet Petrus, aliud Cephas, sed quod, quam nos latine et graece petram vocamus, hanc hebraei et syri propter linguae inter se viciniam, Cepham nuncupent.* Theodore Beza also understood it thus. For commenting on this passage of St. Matthew he says: *Dominus syriace loquens, nulla usus est agnominatione, sed utrobique dixit Cepha: quemadmodum et vernaculum nomen* Pierre *tam de proprio, quam de appelativo* dicitur. In graeco quoque sermone πέτρος *et* πέτρα *non re sed terminatione tantum differunt.* See CORNELY, *Cursus Scripturae Sacrae*, Vol. III. *Introductio Specialis.* Parisiis, Lethielleux, 1886. Pp. 38–52; PATRIZI, *De Evangeliis.* Friburgi, 1853; CLARKE, *The New Testament.* Preface. Baltimore, 1836; HORNE, *Introduction*, Philadelphia, Vol. II, p. 298.

lars which St. John relates in his Gospel, and which are intimately connected with this argument. The one precedes and the other follows the fact narrated by St. Matthew. In the one[1] St. John assures us that when Andrew had conducted his brother Simon to Jesus, the latter looked at him, and foretelling the future, said to him: "*Thou shalt be called Cephas*, that is, *a rock*, and upon this rock I will build my Church." In the other[2] St. John explains the sense in which Christ *built* His Church upon Peter, namely, by constituting him His Vicar and committing to him the duty of feeding on earth all His lambs and sheep: *Pasce agnos meos; pasce oves meas*, that is, all those of whom He in heaven is the eternal and good Shepherd,[3] the *Pastor magnus ovium*[4] and the *Princeps pastorum omnium*.[5]

That the words recorded by St. Matthew were addressed by Christ to Peter *only* is evident from the whole discourse and from the change made of his name. Thus, in the writings of St. Paul and in the Acts of the Apostles, whilst all the other Apostles are called by their old Jewish names, he is never called *Simon*, but designated by the name of *Cephas* or Peter. If, therefore, to Simon, son of John, alone the appellation was given by Christ, it is evident that the Apostles and the first disciples believed that to him *only* the words of our Lord were addressed.

The fathers and doctors of the Eastern and Western Churches *before the ninth century* unanimously confess their adherence to this interpretation. Thus St. Cyprian says: "The Lord speaks *to Peter* these words: *I say to thee, that thou art Peter, etc. . . . Upon* him *alone* He built His Church and to him He committed the charge of feeding His sheep."[6] "For the sake of unity," says St. Optatus, "St. Peter was deemed worthy to be preferred to all the Apostles,

1 I, 42. 2 xxii, 15–17. 3 John xi, 14.

4 Hebr. xiii, 20. 5 1 Pet. v, 4.

6 "Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum: *Ego dico tibi*, inquit, *quia tu es Petrus . . .* Super *illum unum* aedificat Ecclesiam suam et *illi* pascendas mandat oves suas." *De Unitate Ecclesiae*, num. iv; Migne, P. L. Vol. IV, p. 499.

and to receive *alone* the keys of the kingdom of heaven that he might impart them afterwards to the others."[1] St. Pacianus of Spain uses the same argument against his Donatist adversary. "The Lord spoke to Peter *alone* that through *one* he might establish unity."[2] Among the Orientals such great luminaries as St. Basil,[3] St. Gregory Nazianzen[4] and many others[5] have taught the same. The first writes: "To St. Peter, who *alone* was the recipient of more evidences of favors and blessings than the other Apostles, were committed the keys of the kingdom of heaven." The second says that: "Among the disciples of Christ, although all were elevated and deemed worthy of being chosen, yet this one (that is, Peter *alone*) was called a *rock* and was destined to be the foundation of the Church.

XXII.

Now, among the privileges granted to Peter alone is precisely that one contained in the promise to which Leo XIII calls in particular the attention of the dissenting Orientals: *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church.* In these words Christ, like a wise architect, promises to His disciple to erect upon him, as upon a solid foundation, the wonderful edifice of the earthly Jerusalem, a figure of heaven; thus, by a beautiful and simple metaphor, He reveals to us

1 "Bono unitatis beatus Petrus . . . et praeferri Apostolis omnibus meruit, et claves regni coelorum communicandas caeteris, *solus* accepit." *De Schismate Donat.* Lib. vi, c. 3; Migne, P. L. Vol. XI, p. 1087.

2 "Ad Petrum locutus est Dominus; ad *unum* ideo ut unitatem fundaret ex *uno*." *Ad Sempron.* Epist. iii, n. 12; Migne, P. L. Vol. XIII, p. 1071.

3 Ὁ μακάριος Πέτρος, ὁ πάντων μὲν τῶν μαθητῶν προκριθεὶς, μόνος δὲ πλεῖον τῶν ἄλλων μαρτυρηθεὶς καὶ μακαρισθεὶς. *De Iudicio Dei*, n. 7; Migne, P. G. Vol. XXXI, p. 671.

4 Ὁρᾷς τῶν Χριστοῦ μαθητῶν, πάντων ὄντων ὑψηλῶν, καὶ τῆς ἐκλογῆς ἀξίων ὁ μὲν Πέτρα καλεῖται, καὶ τοὺς θεμελίους τῆς Ἐκκλησίας πιστεύεται. *Orat.* xxxii, n. 18; Migne, P. G. Vol. XXXVI, p. 194.

5 See KNABENBAUER, *Commentarius in Evang. secundum Matthaeum*, Vol. II. Parisiis, Lethielleux, 1893, pp. 58 and fol.

that, according to the design of God, Peter was to stand in the same relation to the Church as a true and perfect society, in which a foundation stands to its edifice, namely, to be the principle of its unity and stability. But this principle of a social organism is not and cannot be anything else than the *supreme authority*, which alone is capable to direct the members of the society in the efficient use of the means, and by which it exists and acts, and which alone, like a soul in the living body, can give to it unity, motion and continuous existence. Hence, it necessarily follows that he who in a society represents and exercises supreme authority, should possess a primacy not only of honor, but also of true and proper jurisdiction.

But granted, the Patriarch resumes, that the discourse of Christ recorded by St. Matthew is addressed to Peter alone; nevertheless, the words *super hanc petram* must not be understood to refer to Peter, *as Leo XIII erroneously understands* them, but rather to his confession. The error of Leo XIII appears, in the opinion of the Patriarch, all the more disgraceful since "it is well known, even to the followers of the Pope, that in the first centuries of the Church that passage of the Gospel to which the Pope of Rome refers us, was, according to the orthodox interpretation, understood *otherwise* by tradition and by *all* the holy fathers; these took the fundamental and firm rock upon which the Lord built His Church to be meant in a metaphorical sense and to signify the confession of Peter with regard to our Lord."[1]

And the Patriarch concludes by stating that the interpretation of Leo XIII according to which the *rock* signified the Apostle Peter himself, *was entirely unknown in the Church.*

[1] *Καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ εὐαγγελικὸν χωρίον, εἰς ὃ παραπέμπει ὁ ποντίφηξ τῆς Ῥώμης: "Σὺ εἶ Πέτρος καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν", γνωστὸν καὶ αὐτοῖς τοῖς παπισταῖς τυγχάνει, ὅτι κατὰ τοὺς πρώτους τῆς Ἐκκλησίας αἰῶνας ἥ τε παράδοσις καὶ πάντες ἀνεξαιρέτως οἱ θεῖοι καὶ ἱεροὶ Πατέρες πάντῃ ἀλλοίως καὶ ἐν πνεύματι ὀρθοδόξῳ ἑρμηνεύουσι, πέτραν θεμελιώδη καὶ ἀσάλευτον, ἐφ' ᾗ ὁ Κύριος ᾠκοδόμησε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ Ἐκκλησίαν, ἧς πύλαι ᾅδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν, ἐννοοῦντες μεταφορικῶς τὴν ὀρθὴν τοῦ Πέτρου ὁμολογίαν περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου, ὅτι "Αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός, ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος."* *Litterae Encyclicae*, § 14.

Our readers will pardon us if, since we feel reluctant to show any disrespect towards the Patriarch, we do not qualify this bold assertion as it deserves. Suffice it to say that it is not the Pope of Rome, but rather someone else who commits "a disgraceful error" in this matter. In fact, were we to collect all the passages of the Fathers of the Church who understood these words in the same sense as Leo XIII understands them, we could fill a volume. Let us cite but a few. To SS. Cyprian and Gregory Nazianzen, whom we quoted in the preceding paragraph, we shall add St. Ambrose among the Western and St. Cyril of Alexandria among the Eastern Fathers. The former, in his Treatise of Faith, says: "Since Christ, by His own authority, gave the *kingdom* to Peter, could He not confirm the faith of this man, *whom in calling a rock He declared to be the foundation of the Church?*[1] The latter in his Commentaries says that Christ "no longer permits him to be called Simon . . . but adapting the name to the thing, from a rock He calls him Peter, *because He was about to build upon him His Church.*"[2]

XXIII.

Among the Roman Pontiffs who flourished during "the first nine centuries of the Church," one of the most esteemed and respected by the Orientals even in our own days, is St. Leo the Great. They celebrate his feast on February 18th, and in their Liturgy call him a great doctor inspired by God to proclaim the doctrines of religion: *ὑπὸ θεοῦ κινούμενος εὐσεβείας διδάγματα ὡς ἐν θεοχαράκτοις πλαξὶ ἐτυπώσας.*[3]

The following is the short but pithy commentary which this great doctor has left us of these words of Christ: "*And*

1 "Cui propria auctoritate *regnum* dabat, huius fidem firmare non poterat; quem cum *petram* dicit, firmamentum Ecclesiae indicavit?" *De Fide*, lib. IV, n. 56, Migne, P. L. Vol. XVI, p. 628.

2 *Ἀπὸ τῆς πέτρας μετωνόμαζε Πέτρον· ἐπ' αὐτῷ γὰρ ἔμελλε τὴν αὐτοῦ θεμελιοῦν Ἐκκλησίαν.* *Comm. in Evang. Ioan.* lib. II. MIGNE, P. G. Vol. LXXIII, p. 219.

3 See NILLES, *Kalendarium manuale utriusque Ecclesiae*. Oeniponte, 1879, Vol. I, p. 107.

I, said Christ to Simon son of John, *say to thee;* that is, as my Father hath manifested to thee my divinity, so do I make known to thee thy superiority: *That thou art Peter;* that is to say, although I am the firm rock, the corner-stone, the foundation besides which no one can lay any other; nevertheless, *thou also art a rock rendered firm in my strength*, so that what belongs to me by my nature *I desire thee to possess by participation in me.*" [1]

These words should convince the Patriarch that the interpretation which says that Peter is the *rock* upon which Christ promised to build His Church was not, as he asserts, "*entirely unknown* in the Church of the first nine centuries;" and he will also understand how Christ being *by nature the corner-stone*, does not prevent St. Peter from becoming a sharer in the strength of Christ, so that *by participation* he may be called and truly is the foundation rock of the Church. Whence St. Jerome, whose knowledge of the Oriental languages and of the sacred books is recognized by the whole Church, writes: *Non solum Christus petra, sed Petro Apostolo donavit ut vocaretur petra.*[2] For the rest, the Patriarch would have done well to consult on this point Theophylactus, who was never suspected of being an adherent of Rome. He makes Christ speak thus to Peter: *Te habeo ut principem discipulorum . . . qui post me Ecclesiae petra es et firmamentum.*[3]

It is evident that the assertion of the Patriarch that "*all* the Fathers of the first nine centuries *unanimously* interpreted the cited passage of St. Matthew *entirely differently* from the

1 *Et ego*, inquit, *dico tibi;* hoc est, sicut Pater meus tibi manifestavit divinitatem meam, ita et ego tibi notam facio excellentiam tuam: *quia tu es Petrus;* idest, cum ego sim inviolabilis petra, ego *lapis angularis qui facio utraque unum*, ego fundamentum praeter quod nemo potest aliud ponere (Ephes. 11, 14 and 20); tamen *tu* quoque *petra es* quia mea virtute solidaris, ut quae mihi potestate sunt propria, sint tibi mecum participatione communia LEO MAGNUS, Serm. IV, cap 2, Migne, P. L. Vol LIV, p. 149.

2 *Comm. in Jerem* lib. III cap. 16, Migne, P. L. Vol XXIV, p. 786

3 "Ὅτι ἐπειδὴ σε τῶν μαθητῶν ἔξαρχον ἔχω,... Τοῦτο γὰρ προσήκει σοι ὡς μετ' ἐμὲ ὄντι τῆς Ἐκκλησίας πέτρᾳ καὶ στηρίγματι. *Comm. in Lucam.* XXII, MIGNE, P. G. Vol. CXXIII, p. 1074.

interpretation given to it by Leo XIII," is grossly false. Equally false is his other assertion concerning the *tradition* of the Church, so far as it is expressed in the Liturgy and considered distinct from the teaching of the Fathers. This matter has been clearly explained, with regard to the Greek Liturgy, by Pitra,[1] and with regard to the Syriac Liturgy, by Martin;[2] hence it will suffice to enumerate here some of the titles given in the offices of the Orientals to St. Peter, and which plainly confirm the interpretation given by Leo XIII. St. Peter is called πέτρα καὶ κρηπὶς *rock and foundation* (Vespers); ἡ πέτρα τῆς πίστεως, *rock of faith* (Matins); ἡ κρηπὶς τῆς πίστεως, *foundation of faith* (Lauds); τῶν ἀποστόλων προεξάρχων *first prince of the Apostles* (Vespers).[3]

XXIV.

Let it not be said that the Pontiff's argument will not stand since the words of Christ *super hanc petram* may be understood of the confession of Peter, since many, though not all, of the holy Fathers understand them in this sense; for such an interpretation is not opposed to the one given by us, but rather confirms it, since both mean the same thing. If Peter is the foundation of the Church he is such by virtue of his confession, and if this confession is the foundation of the Church it is such not merely because it is a confession, but precisely because it is the *Confession of Peter*. Suppose it true what the Patriarch understands by the words *super hanc petram*, namely, that they refer to the confession of

1 PITRA, Card. I. B. *Hymnographie de l'Eglise grecque, dissertation accompagnée des offices du 16 Janvier du 29 et 30 Juin en l'honneur de Saint Pierre et des Apôtres.* In the "Analecta sacra Spicilegio Solesmensi parata" Parigi. 1876. Cf. COZZA-LUZZI, *De Rom. Pont. auctoritate doctr. testimonia lit. eccles. graecae.* Romae, 1876.

2 MARTIN, *Revue des sciences ecclésiastiques*, an. 1877, pp. 97–131.

3 See NILLES, *op. cit.* Vol. I, pp. 193, 194. Gregory XVI wrote in 1841 to Cardinal Lewicki concerning some *innovations* introduced by the modern Greeks into their Liturgy: "Nec refert si recens apud hos aliqua in libris liturgicis *resecta* forsan hoc in genere, aut *subdole immutata* fuerint, quum immo ex mutationibus hujusmodi nedum ipsarum auctores inexcusabiles fierent, sed ipsa quoque illorum testimoniorum vis illustrior per eam *fraudem* ac manifestior evaderet."

Peter; surely this interpretation does not destroy, but, on the contrary, proves the very primacy of Peter and of his successors, which he persistently inveighs against. We cannot otherwise understand this confession than to allow that it is an *authoritative* confession, for in this sense only can it make the Church firm and be *the principle of her unity and stability.* In other words, we must understand that the profession of faith and the teaching of Peter must be the *infallible norm* of the belief of all Christians.[1] And since the Church of Christ was not to cease with Peter, but was to continue to the end of time, it was necessary that this confession should be perpetuated in his successors, in whom he, teaching the nations, continues to be the foundation of the Church.

In this sense the Council of Ephesus, the third "of the seven Ecumenical Councils," to which the Patriarch so persistently appeals, expressed with the consent of the two hundred Oriental Fathers present, its approbation of the declaration made by Philip, priest and legate of the Apostolic See: "No one doubts, and it has been acknowledged in all ages, that the holy and most blessed Peter, *ὁ ἔξαρχος κεφαλὴ τῶν ἀποστόλων*, the prince and chief of the Apostles, *the column of* faith *καὶ θεμέλιος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας*, the *foundation* of the Catholic Church, received from Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Redeemer of the human race, the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and that the power of loosing and

1 Among all the strange statements in which the Encyclical of Constantinople abounds, the most remarkable seems to us the one which concerns the *fallibility* of St Peter. That St. Peter was not infallible is proved, according to the Patriarch, from the fact that this Apostle thrice denied our Lord and was twice rebuked by St Paul. This pretended proof is based on two erroneous assumptions. The first is that St Peter, when he denied Christ, *non novi hominem*, was acting in the capacity of *Sovereign Pontiff*. Now St. Peter was appointed *Pope*, that is, *rock* of the Church, *after* the resurrection of Christ (John xxi). The second false assumption is that the *Cephas*, of whom St Paul speaks, is identical with St. Peter, which is denied by some of the Fathers of the first nine centuries; or that even if it were Peter, the controversy was concerning a point of doctrine, instead of being the occasion of a temporary concession to draw the Jews and Gentiles more easily to the true faith.

retaining sins was given to him ; *who down to this time and to the end of time lives and judges in his successors*." [1]

Accordingly, we find that the same Fathers, who occasionally explain the words *super hanc petram* as referring to the confession of St. Peter, do not fail in other places to call him the foundation of the Church and the groundwork of its faith. Among these we may mention St. John Chrysostom, whom the Greeks deservedly venerate as the *most holy and ecumenical doctor* of the Church. In one passage he gives to St. Peter the title of foundation of faith: τὸν Πέτρον τὴν κρηπῖδα τῆς πίστεως ;[2] in another, after calling him the column of the Church and the foundation of truth, he adds that he is the chief of the assembly, the mouth-piece of all the Apostles, the head of the family, the ruler of the world: τὸ στόμα τῶν Ἀποστόλων, ὁ στῦλος τῆς ἐκκλησίας, τὸ στερέωμα τῆς πίστεως, ὁ τῆς ὁμολογίας θεμέλιος, ὁ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀλιεύς. . . ἡ κεφαλὴ τῆς φατρίας ἐκείνης, ὁ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἁπάσης προστάτης.[3]

XXV.

If the Patriarch, before writing his patriarchal and synodical Encyclical, had followed the counsel of the Pope of Rome "to consider this question in its origin, to ascertain the views of their ancestors and to consult the traditions of the early Church," he would not now be placed in the light of bad faith, or at least of inexcusable ignorance, since what he asserts is contradicted by the very testimonies to which he appeals. Had he followed that counsel he would have been at least more cautious and circumspect in declaring *erroneous* the interpretation of the text of St. Matthew, given by Pope Leo XIII, and would, no doubt, not have rejected as *a palpable error*, προφανῆς πλάνη,[4] the fact maintained by the Pontiff in his *Apostolic Letter*, viz : "Ante illud tempus, quo

1 Act. III, MANSI, Edit Florentiae 1760, Vol. IV, p. 1295.

2 *Hom. contra ludos et theathra*. Migne, P. G. Vol. LVI, p. 265.

3 *Hom. De Talent.*, n. 3, Migne, P. G., Vol. LI, p 20. See also *Hom. VI in Act. Apost.* Ibid. Vol LX, p 56.

4 Encyclical Letter, § 16.

tempore homo separavit quod Deus coniunxerat, sanctum erat apud omnes Christani orbis gentes Sedis Apostolicae nomen, Romanoque Pontifici, ut Beati Petri successori legitimo, ob eamque rem Iesu Christi in terris Vicario, Oriens pariter atque Occidens consentientibus sententiis sine ulla dubitatione parebant."

The Patriarch will understand how much the East and West venerated the Apostolic See of Rome and pledged its united obedience to the Roman Pontiff, before the Photian schism took place, when we cite for him a few of the declarations made by the most authoritative and best known doctors that flourished in the Church during those first nine centuries, to whom he refers us with so much assurance in order to convince us of the *evident error* of Leo XIII. Among the ancient Fathers, one of the most esteemed in the East and West is St. Irenaeus. He was born in Greece and was taught by the disciples of St. John the Apostle. Afterwards he went to Gaul where he died in 202, illustrious for the care with which he governed the churches confided to him, for the books he wrote against heretics, and for the martyrdom which he sustained for Christ. This Saint, after calling the Church of Rome *a gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro et Paulo fundata et constituta*, the greatest, most ancient and most celebrated of all the churches: *Ecclesia maxima, antiquissima et omnibus cognita*, declares that she has *potiorem principalitatem* over all the churches of the world. From this, according to St. Irenaeus, follow two effects. First, that not only has the Church of Rome herself preserved intact the doctrine of the Apostles, but that through her instrumentality this doctrine has been preserved among all the faithful of the world: *In qua semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quae est ab Apostolis traditio.* Secondly—and this is directly to the point, inasmuch as it supports the contention of Leo XIII which is denied by the Patriarch—all the individual churches, or in other words, all who desire to belong to the one true Church of Christ must necessarily communicate with and concur with the Church of Rome: *Ad hanc Ecclesiam propter potiorem princi-*

palitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est eos qui sunt undique fideles.[1]

In this manner St. Irenaeus argued, after having enumerated the twelve Popes who held the See of Rome after the martyrdom of St. Peter, beginning with St. Linus and ending with St. Eleutherius (A. D. 174–189),[2] who was governing the Church when Irenaeus wrote these things. And it is important to remember that this was written about the end of the second century of the Church, that is, *seven centuries* before "man (Photius and his followers) separated the Churches which God had joined together."

St. Cyprian, that illustrious defender of Catholic unity, flourished a few years after St. Irenaeus (A. D. 248). Writing of the Church of Rome governed by the Pope, he calls her *locum Petri*,[3] *Petri Cathedram atque Ecclesiam principalem, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est*,[4] *Ecclesiae catholicae radicem et matricem*,[5] and adds that to be in communion with the Pope of Rome is the same as to be a member of the Catholic Church: *Communicare cum Cornelio, hoc est, cum catholica Ecclesia communicare.*[6]

Similar to the argument of Irenaeus and like the teaching of Cyprian is the reasoning of Optatus of Mileve against Parmenian and the Donatist schismatics of his time: *Negare non potes*, he says, *scire te in urbe Roma Petro primo cathedram episcopalem esse collatam, in qua sederit omnium Apostolorum caput Petrus, unde et Cephas appellatus est:* IN QUA UNA CATHEDRA UNITAS AB OMNIBUS SERVARETUR. And having drawn up a list of Roman Pontiffs from St. Peter, *cui successit Linus*, down to Siricius (A. D. 384–398), as Irenaeus

1 *Contra haereses, Lib. III, cap* 3. Migne, P. G Vol. VII, pp. 848–851. We have treated this notable testimony in the *Civiltà Catt.* n. 1061, pp. 525–527. An excellent critical work on this passage by DON CHAPMAN was published in the *Revue Bénédictine*, February, 1895, pp. 49–64.

2 Cf. JAFFÉ, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*. Ed. 2a, Lipsiae, 1885, tom. I. p. 10.

3 *Epist. 52 ad Antonianum*, Migne, P. L. Vol. IV, p. 345, and Vol. III, in which the history of the schism of Novatus is recorded.

4 *Epist. 59 al. 55*. Ibid. 5 *Epist. 48 al. 45*. Ibid.

6 *Epist. 55 al. 52*. Ibid.

had done down to Eleutherius, he affirms that in the Church Pope Siricius is the person *cum quo nobiscum* TOTUS ORBIS *commercio formatarum in una communionis societate concordat.*[1]

St. Ambrose, whose praises were sung in the Oriental Church by St. Basil the Great,[2] speaking in the name of the Council of Aquileja, at which almost all the provinces of the West were represented, recommended to the Emperors, Gratian, Valentinian and Theodosius, the Church of Rome governed by the Pope as the *source* from which arises all authority: *Inde enim* in omnes venerandae communionis iura dimanant.[3] That is to him, without any restriction, the Church and house of God, whose supreme *ruler* is the Roman Pontiff: *Cum totus mundus Dei sit, tamen domus eius Ecclesia dicitur cuius hodie Rector est Damasus.*[4] Moreover, Peter and the Church founded upon him are regarded by this holy doctor as being identical: *Ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclsia.*[5] Peter, therefore, *cui Christus propria auctoritate Regnum dedit*[6] lives and will live in his successors as long as the Church will last. Hence, it is easy to understand how in the opinion of St. Ambrose, as well as in that of St. Cyprian already quoted, no one can belong to the Catholic Church unless he belong to the Roman Church: *Convenire cum episcopis catholicis, hoc est, cum Romana Ecclesia convenire.*[7]

St. Cyril of Alexandria, honored by the Fathers of Chal-

1 *De Schism. Donatist.*, lib. II, n. 2. Migne, P. L. Vol. XI, p. 947.

2 *Epist. 197.* Minge, P. G. Vol. XXXII, pp. 709–712. With regard to St. Basil, the Patriarch seems to know that letter only in which the Saint speaks of the people of the West with a kind of disdain. The passage is not new, since it is found in identical words in the Encyclical which his predecessor and namesake published in 1848 against Pius IX. The true sentiments of St. Basil towards the Pope of Rome are expressed in his letters to Pope Damasus, to St. Athanasius and to the Council of Rome. See Migne. P. G. Vol. XXXII, pp. 431, 433, 483.

3 *Epist. XI*, n. 4, Migne, P. L. Vol. XVI, p. 946.

4 *In I Epist. ad Tim.* cap. 3. *Ibid.* Vol. XVII, p. 471.

5 *Enarratio in Psalmum XL.* *Ibid.* Vol. XIV, p. 1082.

6 *De Fide* IV, n. 56. *Ibid.* Vol. XVI, p. 628.

7 *De Excessu Fratris sui Satyri*, lib. 1, n. 47. *Ibid.* Vol. XVI, p. 1306.

cedon (Act. III) with the title of *Defender of the right and immaculate faith*, and praised by the Greeks in their *Menei*,[1] because *he was found worthy to take the place of Pope Celestine at the Council of Ephesus*, was the first in that Council to subscribe to the declaration that "Peter, the foundation of the Catholic Church, lives and judges to the end of time in the Roman Pontiffs his successors."[2] Though an ardent admirer of the rights of the Oriental Church, he counseled the Fathers that "since they had accomplished all that Pope Celestine had *ordained*, all should subscribe to the deposition of Nestorius."[3] This regard for position of the Roman Pontiffs and their infallible teaching is especially evident from the memorable letter written by St. Cyril in 430 to Pope Celestine, in which he begs the Pontiff to define the true doctrine of the Incarnation and to make known his authoritative decision to the Bishops of Macedonia and of the whole East.[4] Another testimony of this esteem and belief was given by the Fathers of the Third Council of Constantinople, who in their letter to Pope Agatho call him the *Pastor of the first See of the universal Church*, and accept and revere his definitions *as if they had been written by the supreme Head of the Apostles.*[5]

XXVI.

If the testimonies given in the preceding paragraphs are not sufficient to convince the Patriarch that a *manifest error* has been committed, not by Leo XIII, but rather by the Patriarch himself, we may add the no less explicit and applicable testimonies of St. Jerome, who at his arrival in the East having been solicited by each of the three parties in the Church of Antioch to join their communion, answered that the safety of the Church depends on the Roman Pontiff

1 NILLES, *Kalendarium manuale utriusque Ecclesia*, Oeniponte, 1879, Vol. I. p. 75.

2 See paragr. XXIV.

3 *Act. III.* Mansi, Ed. Florentiae, 1760, Vol. XIV, p. 1302 and fol.

4 Migne, P. G. Vol. LXXVII, p. 79–86.

5 MANSI, Ed. Florentiae, 1765. Vol. XI, 683.

and unless we accept his authority as independent and supreme over all, there will be as many divisions in the Church as there are priests: *Ecclesiae salus in summi Sacerdotis dignitate pendet, cui si non exsors quaedam et ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot in Ecclesia efficiuntur schismata, quot sunt sacerdotes.*[1] Then, addressing Pope Damasus, among other important expressions, he uses this one: *Mihi Cathedram Petri et Fidem, apostolico ore laudatam censui consulendam.*[2] His principle was that above all we must adhere to the Chair of St. Peter, which is the Chair of the Roman Pontiff, and that everyone who is separated from the Church and does not gather with the Pope, must be looked upon as scattering the grain of truth: *Cum successore Piscatoris* (so he calls the Pope of Rome) *et discipulo crucis loquor. Ego nullum primum, nisi Christum, sequens, Beatitudini tuae idest Cathedrae Petri communione consocior. Super illam Petram aedificatam Ecclesiam scio . . . Non novi Vitalem, Meletium respuo, ignoro Paulinum, quicumque tecum non colligit, spargit: h. e qui Christi non est, Antichristi est.*[3] For him, just as in the case of the other Fathers whom we have cited, the mark of a true Catholic is adhesion to the Roman See of Peter: SI QUIS CATHEDRAE PETRI IUNGITUR MEUS EST.[4]

St. Maximus, at one time first secretary of the Emperor Heraclius and afterward monk and abbot of the monastery of Chrysopolis, was regarded in the East as a celebrated *theologian and confessor of faith.*[5] For him, as for St. Jerome, the touchstone of orthodoxy is communion with the See of Rome, which "ab ipso incarnato Dei Verbo, sed et omnibus sanctis synodis, secundum sacros canones et terminos, universarum quae in toto terrarum orbe sunt, sanctarum Dei Ecclesiarum *in omnibus et per omnia percepit et habet imperium*, auctoritatem et potestatem ligandi et solvendi.[6]

With the above-mentioned Fathers St. Augustine agrees

1 *Dialog contra Lucif.* n. 9. Migne, P. L. Vol. XXXIII, p. 165.
2 *Epist. I, ad Damasum Papam.* Migne, P. L. Vol. XXII, p. 355.
3 *Ibid.*
4 *Epist. II ad eumdem*, 1. c. p. 359.
5 NILLES, 1. c. p. 78.
6 Migne, P. G. Vol. XCI, p. 144.

in testifying to the veneration of the first centuries for the See of Rome and the Roman Pontiff. We need only consult his works and we shall see that he, like Irenaeus and Optatus, making a catalogue of the Bishops who down to his time had held the See of Rome, considers *all* of them the successors of that Peter in whom alone the unity of all the pastors was prefigured: *Petro enim successit Linus; Lino, Clemens; Clementi, Anacletus*,[1] and so forth. Speaking next of Pope Anastasius, who ruled the Church of Rome when he wrote, he declared that *in illo ordine episcoporum qui ducitur ab ipso Petro, Anastasius nunc eamdem Cathedram tenet.*[2] In the book composed by him *contra Epistolam Fundamenti*, giving the reasons which keep him in the Catholic Church, he writes: *Tenet ab ipsa Sede Petri Apostoli, cui pascendas oves suas post resurrectionem Dominus commendavit, usque ad praesentem episcopatum successio sacerdotum.*[3] In another place, treating of the See of Rome, he designates it the solid and indestructible *foundation* of the Church.[4] For this reason, as he recognized in the Roman Pontiffs the supreme and infallible authority of the whole Church from which there is no appeal: *A sede Apostolica rescripta venerunt: causa finita est;*[5] so with St. Irenaeus, St. Cyprian, St. Ambrose and St. Jerome he would not acknowledge as a Catholic anyone who did not hold the faith of Rome: *Non crederis veram fidem tenere catholicam qui fidem non doces esse servandam romanam.*[6]

What more can the Patriarch desire, in order that he might be convinced of his grave mistake in accusing the

1 *Epist. LIII*, n. 2., Migne, P. L. Vol. XXXIII, p. 196. In one of the Vatican codices of this letter of St. Augustine, Clement is put in the third place. It reads thus: *Petro, Linus; Lino, Cletus; Cleto, Clemens.* For the order of succession consult Funk, *Opera Patrum Apostolicorum*, Tubingae, 1878, *Proleg.* pp. 19–21.

2 *Ibid.* p. 197.

3 *Contra Epistolam Fundamenti*, cap. iv. Migne, P. L. Vol. XLII. p. 175.

4 *Psalmus contra partem Donati*, Migne, P. L. Vol. XLIII, p. 30.

5 *Sermo 131*, cap. 10. Migne, P. L. Vol. XXXVIII, p. 734.

6 *Sermo 120*, n. 13. Mai, *Nova PP. Bibliotheca.* Tom. i. Ed. Romae, 1852, p. 273.

Fathers of the East and West before the ninth century of *never* having recognized the supremacy of the Roman See? Does he perhaps want a still more explicit and formal declaration of their belief in the doctrine? Very well, since he has not as yet, as is evident, read the works of those venerable Fathers, let him turn to the famous Letter[1] of St. Augustine in which the saint reprimands the impudence of the Donatists. There he will find under No. 7 that that belief was expressed by him in the fourth century in exactly the same words which were used fifteen centuries later by the Vatican Council:[2] *In Romana Ecclesia*, he says, *semper Apostolicae Cathedrae viguit principatus.*

XXVII.

Distinguished among all the Eastern and Western Fathers on account of his veneration for the See of Rome and the Roman Pontiff, was the Greek St. Theodore, the Studite, who governed the celebrated monastery of Studio in Constantinople for almost thirty years (797–826). No one belied the false accusation of the present Patriarch better than he, by conferring on the Church of Rome the most honorable titles. He calls the Roman See *the Head of the other Churches; the support of the universal Church on earth; the first Apostolic See; the Church whose judgment must be sought for and accepted by the whole Church according to ancient tradition; the See of Peter; the first among the Churches of God*, Αὕτη ἡ κορυφαιοτάτη τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἧς Πέτρος πρωτόθρονος, κ. τ. λ.[3] The Roman Pontiff is called by him *the supreme Father of the Fathers; the first Apostolic Head of the Universal Church; the Ruler of the first See; the Prince of the Pastors of the Church; the Source of orthodox truth; the one who through Peter received the keys*, Ἔχεις τὸ ἰσχύειν παρὰ Θεῷ ἐκ τοῦ πάντων πρωτεύειν[4] . . . Ὑμεῖς οὖν

1 Migne, Vol. XXXIII, p. 163, Ep. XLIII.

2 Sess. IV, cap. 3.

3 *Epist. lib. II*, 86. Migne, P. G. Vol. XCIX, p. 1331; *Ibid. Epistolae 63, 74, 129*, p. 1281, 1309, 1419.

4 *Ibid. Epist. 13*, p. 1153.

ὡς ἀληθῶς ἡ ἀθόλωτος καὶ ἀκαπήλευτος πηγὴ ἐξ ἀρχῆς τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας, κ. τ. λ.[1] St. Theodore wrote and taught these things at Constantinople when the name of Photius was not yet known. His doctrine, therefore, perfectly conformable to that of Pope Nicholas I,[2] could not have been drawn, as the Patriarch[3] believes with regard to the latter, from the "Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals," since these did not exist at that time.[4]

The true and only source of the teaching of Pope Nicholas, of Theodore and of the other Fathers of the East and West whom we have cited, were the words of Christ recorded in the Gospels (Matt. XVI, 18, 19; Luke XXII, 32; John XXI, 14, 17). At this fountain all the Liturgies of the East, *the venerable antiquity of which* Leo XIII remarks, *stamps them as a splendid ornament to the whole Church*[5] and *furnishes us with testimonies and proofs for the defence of Catholic doctrine*,[6] have received their inspiration. Read, for example, the "Ecclesiastical Offices," which are celebrated in the East in honor of the holy Pontiffs Clement, Sylvester, Leo I, Gregory the Great, Martin I,[7] the Chains of

1 *Ibid Epist 13*, p. 1155, 1156.

2 The Letters of this Pontiff to Photius are found in Migne, P. L. Vol. CXIX, p. 780, 785, 1045.

3 Encyclical Letter, § 17.

4 HINSCHIUS and the most erudite critics hold that the compilation of these decrees could not have been made before 853. It is an historic fact that Photius usurped the See of Constantinople in 863. Cf. BOTTALLA. *The Papacy and Schism*, London, 1869, p. 101.

5 Litterae Apostolicae, Nov. 30, 1894.

6 *Epistola Apostolica*, June 20, 1894.

7 It is rather strange that the Patriarch (Encyclical, § 18), in his anxiety to prove that the Pope is not infallible, should call Pope Liberius who is honored in his church with the title of *Saint*, and whose feast the Orientals celebrate August 27th, a heretic! Of this heretical saint, the Copts in their *Synaxario* of October 9th, say that he was *acerrimus catholicae fidei adversus Arianos propugnator!* (See NILLES, op. cit. Vol. I, p. 260 and Vol. II, p 647). We would remind the Patriarch that, according to the Vatican Council the Pope is infallible only "Cum ex cathedra loquitur, idest, cum omnium Christianorum Pastoris et Doctoris munere fungens pro suprema sua apostolica auctoritate doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universa Ecclesia tenendam definit." If our illustrious adversary is able to prove that in the

St. Peter and SS. Peter and Paul.[1] We shall only transcribe a few short passages as a sample of many others which repeat the same truth. Thus in the Vespers of St. Sylvester, whose feast the Greeks celebrate January 2d, we read: "Silvester pater, visus est veluti columna ignis, SACRO MORE *ducem agens sacri conventus* (that is, of the Council of Nice), et veluti nubes obumbrans, eripiens fideles ab Aegyptio errore (namely of Arius) et *semper infallibilibus doctrinis* transferens ad divinam lucem."[2] Of St. Leo the Greeks sing in their Hymnology that "PETRI SUCCESSOR, *ὁ Πέτρου διάδοχος, eius primatum cum obtinuisset* et fervidum zelum haberet, Dei impulsu tomum (that is, the Dogmatic Letter to the Council of Chalcedon), conscribit."[3] Still more forcible is the following testimony of the ancient Oriental Church, which is found in the Office of St. Gregory, March 12th: "Sacratissime Pastor factus es SUCCESSOR IN SEDE et zelo CORYPHAEI (that is, of Peter), . . . *Successor in sede Principis chori discipulorum*, unde verba veluti fulgores, o Gregori, proferens face illuminas fideles, *διάδοχος τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ χόρου τῶν μαθητῶν τοῦ ἐξάρχοντος χρηματίζεις.*[4]

With these testimonies of the Fathers, of the Councils and of the Oriental Liturgy before our eyes, let the reader form his own estimate of the extravagant assertion of the Patriarch of Constantinople, that *the Church of Rome was not founded by St. Peter, and that neither in the canons nor in the writings of the Fathers is there even an allusion to the fact that the Bishop of Rome is the Head of the Catholic Church, or the successor of St. Peter!*[5] In truth, if the Patriarch is to be declared free from the charge of bad faith, we must assume that he has never read the Acts of the

cases of Liberius, Zosimus and Honorius, cited by him, provided the historical truth of the facts regarding them be maintained, the conditions prescribed by the Vatican Council are verified, we should readily declare him victor in this case.

1 See NILLES, *Kalendarium manuale utriusque Ecclesiae*. Oeniponte, 1879, Vol. I, pp. 51, 72, 107, 121, 137, 193.

2 *Ibid.* p. 51. 3 *Ibid.* p. 107. 4 *Ibid.* p. 121.

5 Encyclical Letter, §§ 14 and 15.

Councils, nor the writings of the Fathers, and that he is wholly unacquainted with the liturgical teaching of his own Church.

XXVIII.

There are, furthermore, abundant facts which go to establish our assertion. Everyone familiar with the data of ecclesiastical history knows how the Roman Pontiffs have always, even before the ninth century, exercised the authority of supreme judges in affairs both of dogma and of discipline. For what else is the meaning of the constantly recurring evidence that the canons of ecumenical or even of particular councils, in grave affairs, are to be held as of no value unless they have been confirmed by the authority of the Popes of Rome,[1] as the two Greek historians Socrates[2] and Sozomenus[3] amply attest.

Did not St. Clement exercise his supreme authority over the whole Church when, in the case of the Corinthians[4] by a formal decree, he canonically restored the ecclesiastics who had been expelled by them, and compelled the partisans of the sedition in the Church of Corinth to submit to the jurisdiction of their legitimate pastors, and to accept the penance due to their transgression? And did not Pope Julius exercise supreme jurisdiction when taking into his hands the

1 Thus the 28th Canon of the Council of Chalcedon, quoted by the Patriarch (§ 15) for the purpose of demonstrating that his authority is equal to that of Leo XIII, was never recognized in the Church. It was formally rejected by St. Leo the Great in answer to a request to sanction it, made by the ambitious abettors of the pretences of New Rome. See CARD. MAZZELLA, *De Religione et Ecclesia*, Disp. VI, a 2, § 4.

2 "The ecclesiastical law demands that the Churches cannot establish canons without the consent of the Roman Pontiff." *Historia Ecclesiastica*, lib. II, c. 17. An excellent *monograph* on this text of Socrates was published in Constantinople in 1879 by *P. Rubian*, in answer to the neo-schismatical monk P. Malachia Ormanian, who denied its authenticity. The copy of it before us is from the Armenian Press of G. Aramian.

3 "It is an episcopal law to consider invalid whatever is done against the decision of the Bishop of the Romans." *Historia Ecclesiastica*, lib. VIII, c. 10.

4 See FUNK, *Opera PP. Apostolicorum*. Tubingae, 1878, pp. 60 and 116–120.

cause of St. Athanasius, Patriarch of Alexandria, who had been condemned by a Council convened at Tyre, the pontiff, finding him innocent, annulled their judgment, replaced him in his See and bitterly reproached the Bishops who had condemned him? The same may be said of the cause of St. John Chrysostom and of St. Flavian, both Patriarchs of Constantinople who were condemned and deposed by Synods, the first of which was held under the presidency of Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria, the second under that of Dioscorous, Patriarch of Alexandria. Both appealed to the Roman Pontiff, and when he absolved them the Greek Church accepted his decision. In the same way Theodoret, who had been condemned by a Council, was readmitted to the communion of the Church in the Synod of Chalcedon, despite the protest of the Egyptian Bishops. And when the latter complained of the pardon accorded to Theodoret, the Fathers of the Council gave no other answer to their remonstrance than that he had been absolved by the Roman Pontiff. Such a reply would hardly have been deemed sufficient, if, indeed, as the Patriarch maintains, the supreme authority of the Pope over the whole Church had been invented during the pontificate of Nicholas I with the aid of the pseudo-Isidorean Decretals of the ninth century? And when this same Pontiff called to him at Rome the two brothers of Thessalonica, the holy apostles Cyril and Methodius, and they, obedient to his command, went to render an account of their faith; and when later they received from his successor, Adrian II, the episcopal consecration with the mission of preaching the Gospel and establishing the Church in Moravia and Pannonia, did not their action plainly involve that they recognized the supremacy of the Pope and their own obligation to submit to the Church of Rome?[1]

1 The genuine history of these Saints is sadly perverted by the Patriarch in his *Encyclical* (§ 22). Those who desire to ascertain the true history will find an excellent account in MARTINOV, *Ann. Eccles. graec. slav.* under July 5th, or GINZEL, *Geschichte der Slavenapostel Cyril u. Method.* or NILLES in his above-mentioned work, *Kalendarium*, p. 103. These contain useful biographical notices on the subject.

But passing over these and other examples with which the history of the Oriental Church abounds, we shall content ourselves in noticing one, alluded to by Leo XIII in his *Apostolic Letter*, and which concerns the Patriarch more directly. It is the series of events which have reference to Photius, and which bring into strong relief the supreme power which the whole Church of the East recognized in the Roman Pontiffs. When Photius, through intrigue and violence, had taken possession of the See of Constantinople after having expelled its legitimate possessor, he himself had at once recourse to the Pope, in order to obtain from him confirmation of the usurped dignity; although he did so by means of hypocrisy, lying protestations and false accounts of facts. And was it not, on the other hand, to this same Pope Nicholas I that St. Ignatius appealed when he found himself unjustly deposed by a conventicle held by the usurper? When Photius was expelled the first time at the beginning of the reign of Basil the Macedonian, both the Emperor and the Patriarch St. Ignatius had recourse to the Pope, and under the presidency of the Legates, sent by the Pope, *ut Ignatii Patriarchae caussam diligenter investigarent et Sedi Apostolicae referrent judiciis plenis ac veracibus*, a Council was held in Constantinople in which Photius was solemnly anathematized and deposed. In this connection we must mention the beautiful letter of St. Ignatius, in which he calls the Roman Pontiff the physician appointed by God to heal the wounds of the Church; he attests that to him were committed by Christ the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and adds that in virtue of this supreme authority he who was guilty has been punished, whilst the innocent has been restored, and he concludes that the Emperor had simply carried out the decrees and submitted to the judgment of His Holiness.[1]

To deny, therefore, that St. Peter had by the institution of Jesus Christ, or by divine right, continual successors in the primacy over the whole Church, and that these successors are

1 See NICETA DAVIDE PAPHLAGONE, *Vita S. Ignatii Cp.* Migne, P. G. Vol. CV, pp. 487–582.

the Bishops of Rome, is equivalent to ignoring the organization of the Church as it was instituted by its divine founder; it is equivalent to closing one's eyes not only to the evidence of the Gospel and of tradition, but to the irrefutable argument of a solemn and historic fact perpetuated during nineteen centuries, and confirmed by innumerable documents.

XXIX.

Our purpose of giving as brief and clear a *Rejoinder* to the Encyclical of the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople as was possible under the circumstances, has been accomplished. What fruit is to be derived from this contention? It appears to us that this examination into the pretended reasons of the Patriarch is capable of producing a sense both of satisfaction and of stimulating zeal; satisfaction and gratitude on the part of the Eastern Catholics who are united to the See of Rome, and zeal to bring about such union on the part of our separated brethren. If the doctrine of the Roman Church sheds such brilliancy that its adversaries, with all their efforts, instead of obscuring it, cause its light to shine more vividly, it is the duty of everyone who has received the inestimable grace of belonging to this legitimate offspring of Heaven to render thanks to God. And, above all, should this great gift be acknowledged by the faithful of the East, who, having withstood the allurements to dissension and having endured persecution, are confirmed in the grace of remaining united to the See of Peter, the See of Rome; they have reason to rejoice for having remained steadfast in the sincerity of that faith, which, as a precious treasure, they have inherited from their forefathers.

In like manner will an examination of the futility of the arguments brought against the Church of Rome by the Patriarch stimulate the separated members of the Church to finally become wise and break the thongs that have hitherto bound them to error.

Let them regard the sad failure which their Patriarch and their Bishops have made before the world in attempting

to speak authoritatively in the Encyclical which we have examined. Is this the kind of men whom the Orientals have for their leaders? Are these the doctrines which they teach? Is this the chair of truth around which the faithful are to assemble to hear those words of life which Our Lord Jesus Christ committed to the Apostles and their legitimate successors?

Let them rather look with an impartial mind to the Chair of Peter, as Leo XIII, inspired by divine charity, bids them to do, and there they will recognize the centre of light, the fountain of life, the bond of Catholic unity, which the Founder of the Church desired for his flock. Viewing her aright they will perceive that "she, intrepid and serene, comes out victorious from the tempests and, secure in the virtue which is derived from heaven, she holds out her sceptre for the safeguarding of nations and the edification of the faithful in the purity of her doctrines and the safeguarding of the divine precepts. She is that standard which God, by the prophetic voice of Isaias, foretold would one day be set up before the nations, around which the fugitives of Israel and the dispersed of Judea, from all the quarters of the earth, were to gather: *Levabit signum in nationes et congregabit profugos Israel, et dispersos Iuda colliget a quatuor plagis terrae.*"[1] These words to our separated brethren of the East are not our own, but those of their holy and great Doctor, St. Maximus,[2] whose voice ought to find to-day in the hearts of his fellow-countrymen that powerful echo which it found in the seventh century when he confessed the Roman Faith against the heresy of the Monothelites.

In conclusion, let us address to these our brethren the beautiful words which St. Augustine, in the form of a psalm addressed to the separated brethren of his day:

1 Isaias XI, 12.

2 This testimony of the great Confessor of Christ was republished on the Codex of Bessarion DLXXXIX of the Marciana Library of Venice, by P. PETER SECCHI in his work mentioned above: *La Cattedra Alessandrina*, ecc. ecc. p. 336.

Venite, fratres, si vultis ut inseramini in vite.
Dolor est cum vos videmus praecisos ita iacere.
Numerate sacerdotes vel ab ipsa Petri sede.
Et in ordine illo patrum quis cui successit, videte.
Ipsa est Petra, quam non vincunt superbae inferorum portae.
Omnes qui gaudetis de pace, modo verum iudicate.[1]

S. M. BRANDI, S.J.

Rome, Italy.

NEW LIGHTS FROM ARCHÆOLOGY ON THE CANON OF THE MASS.

AS the rosebud unfolds but by degrees its beauty in the full bloom of its flower, so the ritual of the Mass has grown from the simple rite of "Breaking the Bread," used by the Apostles, to its present wondrous wealth of significant ceremonial. This development, since the early days of Christianity, has assumed various forms, and we find, accordingly, a diversity of rites, all of which, however, are only different expressions of certain essential elements constituting the great liturgical act of the Mass.[2] Apart from the accounts preserved to us by the older liturgists, we are greatly indebted for much accurate information on this subject, to the more recent investigations of men like Bickell, De Rossi, Probst, Duchesne, Fleury, Franz and others. But although these have succeeded in satisfactorily solving many long standing problems regarding ancient usages in the Church, there are still some questions on which authorities, like Probst and Duchesne, not to speak of others, greatly differ. It is safe to say, however, that among the learned inquirers in this

1 Psalmus contra partem Donati, Migne, P. L. Vol. XLIII, p. 30.

2 That which all the mass formularies have in common is: the offertory, the consecration and the communion. The thanksgiving (gratias agamus) with the *trisagion* (sanctus) is also found in all the liturgies, and likewise, in nearly all, the Lord's Prayer.

domain of ecclesiastical study, those have been most successful who have brought to the task of investigation a more or less thorough acquaintance with archæology. The habitual intercourse, if we may say so, with the monuments of the past, begets in the student a certain familiarity with ancient liturgical customs which sharpen the power of observation, and impart to him a ready instinct by which he is enabled clearly to interpret what cannot be gleaned from a mere study of books. Thus the liturgist, who is at the same time an archæologist, is likely to obtain much light, in his scientific search, from the obscure recesses of the Catacombs.

In the following pages I offer some suggestions gained in this manner, regarding the meaning of certain portions of the mass-canon, which have hitherto received no adequate explanation from liturgical writers. Whatever contributes to shed light upon the sublime mystery of our holy religion, which we daily celebrate, is worthy of our thoughtful consideration, all the more when it serves to lead us to a deeper sense of our participation in the mediatorship of our Redeemer. Besides, such inquiry is likely to promote further investigation and thus open new fields of knowledge in line with this ever interesting subject.

I.

ORIGIN AND MEANING OF THE WORDS "HAEC COMMUNICATIO ET CONSECRATIO."

During the first centuries the Holy Sacrifice was solemnly offered by the bishop on Sundays and holidays, on the anniversaries of the martyrs, and on the so-called "station" days. In these celebrations the pontiff was assisted by his priests who took part in the act much in the manner which is still observed in the ordination service. But when, in time, the congregations of the faithful grew larger, so that, especially in the cities, it was found impossible to admit all to the celebration of this one mass, the priests had to carry out the liturgical functions in separate churches, where such of the

faithful as were placed under their parochial charge attended.[1] Naturally, the mass service in these churches, which were called *tituli*, was not as solemn and protracted as that in which the bishop officiated.[2]

But although in the course of time each *presbyter* celebrated the sacred mysteries in his own titular church, there continued to exist that close inter-communion, that identity—we might say—of participation in the Holy Sacrifice which had from the beginning bound together the bishop and his clergy at the altar, and which was to indicate that characteristic bond of peace and harmony which united them in the Lord. Hence dates the ordinance of Pope Zephyrinus, renewed by Urban I, Milziades, Siricius, and Innocent I, which obliged the presbyters of the titular churches to receive from the bishop at his mass some portion of the Host consecrated by him (*corona consecrata*), which each was to place in the chalice and commingle with the Precious Blood in his own mass subsequently celebrated in his parochial church. The priest, as he placed the consecrated Particle obtained from the bishop in the chalice, said the words, almost identical with those still used in the liturgy of the Western Church: "*Commixtio et consecratio*," etc.[3]

1 The chapels in the Roman Catacombs formerly used for the divine service, as also the oratories and ancient cemeterial basilicas are, as a rule, hardly large enough to accommodate more than a hundred persons. Hence, it cannot be assumed that the whole Roman community of Christians could have attended the pontifical service held in these places. Cf. KRAUS, *Real Encyclop.* II, p. 782 "Stations-Tage."

2 The difference between "high" and "low" masses can thus be traced back to very remote times. There are many evidences to be found in the Catacombs to show that, whilst solemn mass was celebrated on the anniversaries of the martyrs in the cemeterial basilicas, the more simple rites were carried out in the *hypogaeum* "ad corpus," where the limited space of a single *cubiculum* permitted no other celebration.

3 DE ROSSI, *Bulletino di Archæologia Christiana*, 1864, pp. 89–91; 1867, pp. 20 and 59. According to the *Liber Pontificalis*, Pope Zephyrinus (202–219) ordained that the presbyters were to receive the *corona consecrata* or *fermentum*, *i. e.*, the Blessed Sacrament, from the hands of the bishop. Some twenty years later we read of Pope Urban I: *fecit ministeria sacrata omnia argentea, et patenas argenteas viginti quinque posuit.* At this time

Thus it becomes evident in what sense the word *consecratio* is to be understood in this particular place; for it is needless to point out that the *commixtio corporis et sanguinis* does not necessarily belong to the act of consecration which is completed in the words of Our Lord: *Hoc est corpus meum; hic est sanguis meus.* The act of consecration and the consecrated species in the mass of the presbyter are simply represented as combining with the act of consecration and also with the sacred Species brought from the solemn mass celebrated by the bishop. In this wise the *commixtio consecrationis*, which indicates the intimate union between the sacrificing priests and their bishop, is symbolically expressed in the *commixtio corporis et sanguinis* when the priest at the altar places a part of the sacred Host in the chalice.

It was customary for the bishop to hand the sacred Particles intended for the titular churches to the presbyters or their ministers with the words: *Pax Domini*, etc. This made the *commixtio* an explicit expression of that solemn *communio in sacris* which was to keep bishop and priests together in the unity of peace and faith; just as the bishops were in the habit of sending to each other the sacred Host as a pledge of their common faith and doctrine. From a desire to harmonize the liturgical functions of the low mass with those of the pontifical mass, the essential features of the latter were retained even after the practice of transmitting the sacred Particle to the titular churches had gone into disuse. Hence, this rite was not wholly eliminated, but merely modified, so that each presbyter as he celebrated the Holy Mysteries, broke a part from the Host consecrated by himself and dropped it into the chalice. For the same reason the words *Pax Domini*, formerly pronounced only by

Rome had twenty-five *tituli* or parochial churches, and the presbyteri of these churches had hitherto received the *corona consecrata* upon plates or patens made of glass or some other suitable material. But Urban had these twenty-five patens made of silver, as also the other vessels used in the sacred service. (De Rossi describes in detail one of the glass patens belonging to the fourth century, which was found at Cologne.) See also DUCHESNE'S "*Fractio panis*" in *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, pp. 176, 177.

the bishop, were now repeated, in the spirit of union, by each celebrant at his mass.

Accordingly, we have at this part of the Holy Sacrifice a constant renewal of the mystical compact between the bishop and his clergy, who become mutually identified in the bond of peace and faith. Each daily celebration of the mass strengthens this tie and confirms the hierarchical order, binding the priests to their bishop, the members to their head, and infusing perpetual life into the entire mystical body through the sacramental Body of Christ.

II.

MEANING OF THE CHEIROTONIA AT THE "HANC IGITUR."[1]

It is evident from the construction of the "choir" in several of the ancient basilicas of Rome, such as S. Clemente, SS. Nereo ed Achilleo, S. Caecilia, that the Sacred Mysteries were formerly celebrated, as was said above, by the bishop together with the presbyters. The episcopal throne (cathedra) in these churches is at the back of the apse, somewhat elevated by several steps. At the right and left of the bishop's seat, in a semicircle, are the marble benches for the priests who participated in the liturgical function of the mass. Fronting these is the main altar, which stands entirely free beneath the baldachino. Still further front, between the altar and the nave, is the place reserved for the chanters (schola cantorum) which is separated from the body of the church by a screen, at the right and left side of which are the *ambos* for the reading of the Epistles and Gospels. The four columns which support the baldachino over the altar are connected at the top by four rods which hold the movable rings to which formerly the *vela* or curtains were attached. These curtains when drawn served to conceal the altar from the faithful, leaving

1 Consult on this subject KRAUS, *Real Encyclopedie* I, p. 425 and 646; THALHOFER, *Handb. d. Kath. Liturgie* (first edit.) II—1 p. 233.

open the one side opposite the bishop's throne, from which the latter and his assistant ministers approached for the performance of the sacred rite.[1] The assistants who took immediate part in the sacred functions were, besides the minor clerics, the deacons, chief of whom was the archdeacon. These, accompanying the bishop as his *ministri sacrae actionis*, performed the rites of the mass, whilst the *presbyteri*, who retained their seats in the semicircle of the apse, took part as *concelebrantes* in the act of consecration itself. We have seen that they received from the bishop's hand the consecrated Particle which was to be mingled with the Precious Blood in the mass subsequently celebrated by themselves in their respective titular churches. But this could hardly be called a direct participation in the act of consecration.

How, then, did the *presbyteri* become *concelebrantes* in the real sense of the word, that is to say, as consecrators with the bishop? The direct answer to this question came to the writer when for the first time he witnessed at Rome the celebration of a solemn pontifical mass in the Slavic rite, on the occasion of the centenary festivals of SS. Cyril and Methodius, the Apostles of the Slavic nations, in the ancient church of San Clemente. Here, as has been mentioned above, the architectural arrangement of the choir is still that of the early Christian times; for when, during the twelfth century, the present church was built upon the foundations of the ancient basilica which dated back to the sixth century, the entire choral construction was transferred to the new edifice. At the celebration to which I refer, the bishop took his seat upon the throne (cathedra) at the back of the apse, whilst the priests placed themselves to the right and left of him. As the moment of the elevation approached, when the bishop took the host into his hands, all the priests with one accord arose, and whilst the words of consecration were being pronounced, they stretched out their hands towards the altar.

1 Occasionally we read of *tetravela* showing that the altar could be curtained off from all four sides.

What did this action (cheirotonia) signify?

It was a silent invocation of the Holy Ghost upon the *oblata;* for, just as in the Sacraments of Confirmation and Sacred Orders the priests who assist the bishop participate in the act of imposition of hands by which the divine Spirit is invoked upon those who are being confirmed or ordained, in like manner did these Slavic priests in San Clemente take part in the consecration of the pontifical mass. And what these priests did had been done in the ancient Church by the clergy who assisted the bishop in the sacred functions. Thus the *cheirotonia*, or *cheirothesia* as it was also called, signified the united invocation of the divine Spirit for the accomplishment of the stupendous miracle of transubstantiation.[1]

Whilst the *presbyteri* in their titular churches celebrated the Sacred Mysteries without the solemn *corona* of priests and deacons, and were attended simply by a number of minor clerics as was prescribed for every liturgical service, they sought, as we may readily suppose, to retain as far as possible, the ceremonial rites of the pontifical mass which was the pattern of their rubrical observance.[2]

1 DUCHESNE in his *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 167, explains this act in a somewhat different manner He believes that, taking into account various indications from ancient sources: "Il semble resulter que les prêtres avaient eu ici, à l'origine, une rôle spécial. On tenait devant eux des *oblatae* posées sur des patènes. Ils récitaient le canon au même temps que le pape, et célébraient ainsi avec lui la liturgie eucharistique .Si j'ai bien compris les textes en question l'usage eût été au commencement du sixième siècle, pour toutes les messes. Au huitième siècle le rite n'était plus observé qu'aux fêtes de Noël, de Pâques, de Pentecôte et de Saint Pierre. Les autres jours la cooperation des prêtres ne se produisait que pour l'offrande, la fraction et la communion."

This theory is hardly tenable, for if each priest assisting at the pontifical mass actually consecrated a separate host presented to him on a paten by a cleric, we must assume that the same was done with regard to the chalice; otherwise there would have been no complete participation. On the other hand, we have the practice of consecrating in union with the bishop, by pronouncing with him the words of consecration, still maintained in the ordination of the neo-presbyters, in which case the host on the altar is the object to which the common words of consecration are directed.

2 Cf. DUCHESNE 1 c. p. 152: "Le prêtre cardinal n'avait à sa disposition

When, at the present time, the celebrant recites the prayer *Hanc igitur oblationem*, which immediately precedes the consecration, he stretches out his hands over the oblation. There is nothing in these words which suggests any interpretation of the accompanying action, and we can hardly doubt that the latter is simply a remnant of the ancient rite of *cheirotonia* by which the clergy assisting the bishop at the Holy Sacrifice expressed their concomitant intention of consecrating with the pontiff.[1]

III.

THE ORIGIN OF THE WORDS "MYSTERIUM FIDEI."

If we examine the biblical account of the institution of the Holy Eucharist at the Last Supper, we miss the words *mysterium fidei*, which constitute part of the form used by the priest in the consecration of the chalice. This seems strange, and we ask at once, how did the words find their way into this most sublime portion of the canon? The usual explanation given by liturgists is that, according to an ancient tradition in the Roman Church derived from S. Peter, our Lord actually made use of these words, although they have not been recorded by the evangelists. GIHR,[2] THALHOFER[3] and others merely give an interpretation of

que des clercs inferieurs, des acolytes; il était obligé de remplir lui-même beaucoup de fonctions qui à la messe solennelle étaient confiées aux diacres."

1 On this point I am compelled to differ from the opinion of GIHR (*D. h. Messopfer*, p. 591), who surmises that the extension of the hands over the oblation at the *Hanc igitur* had its origin during the fifteenth century; and that the practice in use in several dioceses of France was introduced for the entire Church by order of S. Pius V. It is hardly likely that the Pontiff would carry a local custom of this kind into the ritual of the Roman Missal, even if it were to be admitted that the usage is of so late a date and to be ascribed to the Church of France. The fact is that the prayer, in part at least, is much older, as the words *diesque nostros*, etc., in the canon may be traced to S. Gregory the Great. See DUCHESNE, 1 c. pp. 132 and 168.

2 Op. cit. p. 604.

3 Op. cit. II-I, p. 224.

the words without attempting to account for their origin. STENTRUP, in his work "*De SS. Eucharistiae Sacramento*"[1] remarks that the words are wanting in all the Greek, as well as in some other liturgies. ST. THOMAS[2] explains: "mysterium fidei—*quasi fidei objectum, quia quod sanguis Christi secundum veritatem sit, in hoc sacramento sola fide tenetur.*"

The theory which refers the words to an ancient tradition, handed down from the Prince of the Apostles through the Roman Church, while no trace of their use is found in other churches, hardly commends itself to scholars. The very position of the words in the sentence suggests the thought that they are some heterogeneous element subsequently added to the main clause by way of parenthesis; for they interrupt, seemingly without reason, the principal idea implied in the form of consecration: *Hic est calix sanguinis mei, novi . . . testamenti qui pro vobis effundetur*, as set forth in the genuine Gospel.[3]

But how came these words to be added to the form of consecration? The words "*et aeterni*" cause but little difficulty; but the insertion of "mysterium fidei," breaks up the sentence in such a way that the words "qui pro vobis effundetur," etc., which immediately follow, can only by an effort of the mind be brought to unite with the preceding "calix sanguinis" to which they belong.

We shall find the answer to this question, however, if we call to mind what has been said before, about the manner of celebrating the pontifical mass in the early days. As we saw, the altar was, during the time of consecration, veiled from

1 Edit. Oenip. 1889, p 170

2 P. III, qu. 78, art. 3.

3 The words *et aeterni*, before *testamenti*, which are wanting in many liturgies, are undoubtedly also a later addition to the canon. Similar additions and extensions of the Scriptural text may be found in other mass formularies. Cf. FRANZ: *Die Eucharist. Wandlung* II, p. 35. In the Ambrosian Rite II B., we have the following extension of the latter part of the consecration: *Haec quotiescunque feceritis, in meam commemorationem facietis, mortem meam praedicabitis, resurrectionem meam annuntiabitis, adventum meum sperabitis, donec iterum de coelis veniam ad vos.*

the aspect of the faithful.[1] Only the clergy who sat or stood in the apse, together with the deacons and minor ministers of the mass, could see what was going on at the altar from the Consecration to the Holy Communion. This will not seem so strange to us if we remember the existence, during the early ages of the Church, of the *disciplina arcani*, which was designed to protect the Sacred Mysteries from the profanation of strangers and the irreverence of the curious. Something of this reverential spirit may perhaps be traced at a later day in the old-fashioned *Ostensoria* of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, in which the Sacred Host is guarded by a screen, so as not to expose it to the full gaze of the worshipers; and the low-bent attitude of adoration during the elevation of the Blessed Sacrament in our own days is, perchance, a remnant of this ancient discipline which forbade the eyes of any but the sacred ministers of the altar to look upon the Holy of Holies.

When the moment of consecration had arrived, the bishop descended from his throne in the apse, and went to the altar, surrounded by the deacons and clerics. The *corona* of priests seated in the semi-circle arose, as we saw, to stretch out their hands as a sign of their participation in the sacred act. At the same moment the veil was drawn close around the altar, so, as to hide it from the view of the faithful in the church. Then, at the moment when the mysterious words of consecration had been spoken by the bishop, where to-day the sound of a bell admonishes the people that the God-Man has descended upon the altar, the deacon of the mass sent forth into the expectant silence of the church in clear, low notes, the words: *Mysterium fidei.* They were the signal of adoration to the assembled multitude. Of this beautiful ceremony we have an analogous instance in the liturgy of St. Mark,[2]

1 Cf. KRAUS, *Real-Encycloped.* II, p. 932. "Not all," says St. Ambrose (De Offic. I, 50), "are privileged to gaze upon the awful Mysteries, which are veiled by the Levites, so that those who are not entitled to see may be prevented from seeing, and those who have no right to receive may not receive (the Bl. Eucharist).

2 Consult RENAUDOT I, p. 155.

where at the approach of the moment of consecration the deacon sings out aloud : *Stretch forth your arms !*

There can be no doubt that the altars in the titular churches generally were provided with such curtains or *vela* as we have mentioned. Indeed, the arrangement of the rods to which the movable rings were attached for holding the veils, may still be noticed in the churches of San Clemente, Santa Caecilia, San Lorenzo and others. But each of the priests who said mass in these churches could not, like the bishop, have for his assistance during the celebration of the Holy Mysteries, a deacon who might announce to the people the moment for adoration of the *Mysterium fidei.* Nevertheless, the words were retained and pronounced by the celebrant himself, and thus they became an integral part, placed as it were in parenthesis, of the liturgical function of the mass. No doubt it would harmonize more accurately with the spirit of the ancient liturgy if the priest spoke these words in a somewhat louder tone, or if they were printed upon the canon tables in such a way as to distinguish them from the words of our Lord. This would, however, require the sanction of the S. Congregation of Rites, whose answer to any such suggestion is likely to be : *Nihil innovetur.* Nevertheless, the remembrance of the original purpose of the words can only serve to edify the priest and revive in him the living faith of the olden time as he repeats the expression *Mysterium fidei.*

IV.

THE EPICLESIS (INVOCATION OF THE HOLY GHOST) FOR THE CONSECRATION.

It is well known that the Eastern Catholics, particularly since the time of the Council of Florence, lay great stress upon the Epiclesis or invocation of the Holy Ghost, which they deem essential to the completion of the act of consecration. For this reason our Latin liturgists have sought to demonstrate the existence of the Epiclesis in the Roman Rite ;

some maintaining that it is contained in the oration "*Veni Sanctificator*" at the close of the Offertory, others seeing it in the oration "*supplices te rogamus*" after the elevation.

The important point to be noted is that all the Oriental liturgies contain the Epiclesis, or special prayer invoking the descent of the Holy Ghost to complete the act of transsubstantiation. What makes it difficult to harmonize our liturgy in this respect with that of the Eastern Churches is the fact that their Epiclesis neither immediately precedes nor immediately follows the act of consecration, since several prayers intervene between the latter and the oration to the Holy Ghost. Nevertheless, they consider the Epiclesis more or less the principal element of the act of consecration. The words of our Lord spoken over the bread and wine are indeed absolutely requisite, but, according to the Oriental liturgists, they take, so to speak, effect and fructify only when the Holy Ghost descends upon the oblation. St. John Damascene, to mention only one of the Christian Fathers, expresses this thought in the following manner[1]: In the beginning God spoke: "Let the earth bring forth herbs," and in virtue of this word the earth produces her fruits *when the rain descends*. And again God spoke: "This is my Body;" and it became this Body when, *by the invocation of the Holy Ghost* (διὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως), *the rain, that is to say, the fructifying virtue of the divine Spirit is added* (ἡ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐπισκιάρουσα δύναμις).

The explanation which seeks the Latin Epiclesis in the oration "*Veni Sanctificator*" does not seem to us well founded. Independent of the fact that in many churches of the West the *oblata* were prepared at the beginning of the mass, as is still done in the Dominican Rite, we know that the selection and preparation of the species destined for the consecration was, as a rule, in Rome, Milan and partly in Gaul, consigned to the care of the archdeacon, without any prescribed prayers. The orations found in our present missals at the Offertory are not contained in the ancient liturgical books.[2] Moreover,

1 *De orthod. Fide*, IV, cap. 13.
2 Cf. DUCHESNE l. c., p. 166.

there is no ground for assuming that the *Sanctificator* is intended for the Holy Ghost in particular, since the words following, "omnipotens aeterne Deus," evidently indicate the triune God who is to bless the oblation. On the other hand, we cannot admit that the prayer, *Supplices te rogamus*, recited after the elevation, contains the Epiclesis of the Latin Church, a supposition which rests on the assumption that the *sanctus angelus tuus* in the clause "*ut haec perferri digneris per manus sancti angeli tui*" refer to the Holy Ghost. It is very true that the Holy Ghost is sometimes called "angelus" by the early Fathers of the Church,[1] yet we have an old version of this oration, dating from about the year 400, although falsely attributed to S. Ambrose, which reads: *ut hanc oblationem suscipias in sublimi altari tuo per manus angelorum tuorum.* Furthermore, the Epiclesis is supposed to invoke the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the *oblata*, whereas in the prayer *Supplices* the Holy Ghost is spoken of as carrying them up to the throne of God.[2]

The question remains, is there no Epiclesis, such as we find it in the Eastern Church, in the mass service of the Western liturgy? We answer, yes. The Epiclesis not only existed in the Latin mass formula, but is still recognized in the *cheirotonia* before the consecration. Just as in Confirmation and at the Ordination of clerics, the assisting priests unite with the bishop, extending their hands, and thus actually participate in his invocation of the Holy Ghost, so in like manner did the presbyters when they assisted in the celebration of the pontifical mass. Their *cheirotonia* was a silent Epiclesis, as it is still to-day. It is even probable that formerly a special prayer invoking the Holy Ghost was joined with the *cheirotonia;* for St. Isidor (De Eccl. Off. I, 15), speaking of the influx of the Holy Ghost upon the act of consecration, shows that the idea was familiar in the Western Church, when he says: *Ut oblatio quae Deo offertur sanctificata per Spiritum sanctum, Christi corpori et sanguini conformetur.* At the same moment when, in the ancient Church,

1 FRANZ l. c., p. 106.
2 Cf. DUCHESNE l. c., p. 170.

the bishop pronounced the words of consecration, the priests who formed the "corona presbyterorum" invoked the *sanctificatio oblationis per Spiritum sanctum.* This accounts for the absence of any apparent interpretative connection between the oration *Hanc igitur* and the accompanying action of extending the hands over the oblation. The connection is merely external, temporary; and the *cheirotonia* came to be joined to this prayer only when and where the mass ceased to be celebrated in common with the bishop, each presbyter having to officiate privately in his own church.

It may be asked: Why is the Epiclesis in the Eastern liturgies separated from the consecration, instead of either preceding or following the latter *immediately* as we would expect?

To answer this query we must go back to the liturgical sources opening in the fourth century. The oldest to which we may have recourse are the Syrian liturgies, as formulated in the XXIII Catechesis of S. Cyril of Jerusalem, in the Apostolic Constitutions (II, 57 and VIII 5–15), and in the Homilies of St. Chrysostom, these comprising the observance of the Church of Antioch. There can be no doubt that at that early date, that is to say, during the fourth and fifth centuries, the Oriental liturgy was being enriched by new orations and other additions respecting the formulary of the mass. As an instance of this kind, we need only mention the development which the *Hoc facite in meam memoriam* received, just as it did in the Latin liturgy by the so-called *anamnesis* representing an extension of our Lord's words in the "*Unde et memores,*" etc. Omitting these extensions, we shall find that the Epiclesis in the Oriental liturgies may be easily brought into a moral connection with the words of consecration.

Moreover, it is not difficult to demonstrate the original concurrence, in the Apostolic Church, of the Epiclesis with the words of consecration used by our Lord, when we examine the liturgies of St. James of Jerusalem and of St. Mark. Both give for the consecration of the chalice, the following words: In like manner He took after the meal the chalice

. . . *filled it with the Holy Ghost*, and gave it to His disciples with the words," etc. In the liturgy of St. Cyril, the celebrant prays, after the trisagion (that is, before the account of the "institution") as follows: "Complete this Thy sacrifice, O Lord, by the blessing which comes from Thee through the *descent of Thy Holy Spirit.*" The liturgy of St. Mark has the following: "*Complete, O Lord, this sacrifice of Thy blessing through the coming of Thy all-holy Spirit. For, when our Lord and God and highest King, Jesus Christ, in the night in which He offered Himself for our sins*," etc. (here follows the complete account of the institution).[1]

From what has been said we may conclude that the Eastern liturgies originally joined the invocation of the Holy Ghost immediately with the words of institution of the Bl. Sacrament; and that later additions caused an apparent separation of the two acts which makes it difficult at present to recognize their close moral connection.

It is evident that the high-minded efforts of Leo XIII to eliminate the differences which have existed for so many centuries between the schismatical churches and the Mother Church of Rome, will meet no difficulty from this question regarding the Epiclesis, despite the great agitation it caused at the Council of Florence. Nor can the quasi-dogmatical ὁμολογία ὀρθόδοξος of Peter Mogilas (1640), and the Encyclical of the old patriarch of Constantinople (1851)[2] convince us that this subject will be deemed by either side of any more than secondary consideration in regard to effecting a union between the Churches. At all events, Rome can easily meet the Eastern Churches half way, even if they should consider the Epiclesis as essential to the completion of the sacramental act of consecration.

ANTON DE WAAL.

Campo Santo, Rome.

1 Cf. FRANZ, L, c. ii, p. 147.

2 Cf. FRANZ L, c. i, p. 63 seq.

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

(THIRD ARTICLE ON "CLERICAL EDUCATION.")

OUR considerations on clerical education do not include the scholastic branch of the subject; articles on clerical studies, published in this REVIEW, have ably expounded that part of a seminarian's preparation for the Holy Priesthood. While we may incidentally refer to one or another *desideratum* in the program of studies, we confine our remarks to the internal organization of seminaries and to their most practical management under existing circumstances of time and place in these United States.

Our great seminaries are, as a rule, up to the standard of efficiency which we would wish for the bulk of our clergy. We would, however, advocate a more practical training for the work of the ministry and for the life of self-reliance which most of our young priests have to face almost immediately after leaving the seminary.

Do what we will, there is always a small percentage of vocations resting more or less on human considerations. Even if they are rarer than in many other countries, yet they are an actual factor in the make up of the clerical ranks, and these we all wish to eliminate. We contend that our way of dealing with seminarians would give a better opportunity to weed the ranks of clerical students of undesirable subjects before sacred orders make it an impossibility or cruelty to do so.

We would, therefore, grant to theological students more liberty than they at present enjoy by allowing them to go out occasionally by themselves, instead of in a body or by camerata restricted to a certain territory. Again, we would give them an opportunity of practicing the theoretical knowledge which they acquire in books. During their sojourn at the seminary they will take kindly to supervision, willingly accept admonition and thankfully avail themselves of suggestions made, while they are very apt to disregard all these when they have become asssistants or full-fledged rectors on the mission. To make clear our meaning:

1. Firstly, we would have the seminary situated in the

episcopal city, or so near to it that rapid transit might land its inmates at the cathedral doors in a very short time. This is in conformity with the requirements of the Council of Trent, which directs that "the Bishops shall take care that on festival days, they (the seminarians) . . . . serve in the cathedral and other churches of the place."—Conc. Trid. sess. xxiii, cap. xviii. The seminarians would thus, under the very eye of the Bishop, be initiated into the observance and practice of all the ceremonies of the Church, the rubrics and offices of every order they receive. Besides, the presence of the seminarians would lend to the celebration of religious services in the cathedral a solemnity which is most desirable in the Mother Church of the Diocese. It would attract the people, cause a more steady attendance of the faithful and secure to it means of influencing the community which belongs of right to the Bishop's church. Too often, nowadays, the cathedral is set apart and distinguished from the parish churches more by the burdens it has to assume than by the rights it enjoys. This attendance of the future priests at the cathedral would have a very beneficial influence upon them; they would look upon it more in the light of the Head Church of the Diocese; they would retain an affection for the church which witnessed their first steps in the sanctuary, wherein they were ordained, where they gave their first instructions to the children; the remembrance of the imposing cathedral ceremonies would encourage them to train their altar boys to more efficiency in the ministration of the altar than most choristers now possess; they would not have to plead the awkward excuse of never having seen such ceremonies for their inability to assist the Bishop at holy mass, upon the occasion of his visit to their parish of confirmation, visitation, etc.

2. Where the seminary is built in the country, away from the See, we would have a parish church attached to the seminary or situated within the immediate neighborhood. This arrangement will serve a double purpose. It will enable the reverend professors to practice what they teach, an opportunity most desirable in teachers of moral theology, and the

lack of which has made many a brilliant theorician a most unpractical professor. The famous Dens, whose theology was the standard work of the schools for well-nigh a century, had never heard a confession when, after over thirty years teaching in the Grand Seminary of Mechlin, he was appointed *Canon Poenitentiarius* of the metropolitan church. Custom had so far mitigated the duties of that position that one hour's attendance in the confessional, every week, was considered a fulfilment of the onerous obligations which made the office so important a one. Professor Dens accordingly took his place in the penitentiary confessional of the cathedral, which was apt to draw complicated cases because of the extraordinary powers conferred upon its occupant. After more than an hour's session in the tribunal of penance, Dens crossed over to the confessional of one of the curates, gently rapped at the door, requested the marveling priest to step over to his confessional, when through with his present penitent, to help a waiting and anxious soul on the other side. He then quietly retired to his room never again to venture the difficult application to the actual circumstances of life of the rigid rules of morality. He flourished long as *Canon Theologalis*, but not as *Poenitentiarius!* Among the many teachers of my theological curriculum, I recall with the greatest vividness the practical solutions of one who was considered the less eminent theologian, but who was certainly the most practical *venator animarum* that ever trained young priests to the prudence, charity and mild zeal necessary in the confessional. He taught us how to deal with souls who are too often rebuked by the hard path they are invited to follow, and still oftener left to linger and grope in the dark for want of firmness and solid direction. He had been a rector, and still kept his confessional in the nearest parish church. The professors will have a chance to confer the sacraments to the people in full view of the seminarians ; they will preach to a real flock in the presence of young clerics who are only too anxious to learn how to reach the hearts of the people and how to break to them the word of God. The seminarians will, in turn, have an opportunity of taking their first steps

in the work of the ministry under the vigilant eye of their teachers. Correction, guidance, encouragement in practical details of every-day priest-life will follow, in the class-room, from actual observation; and what a benefit and a lesson it will be to all! The deacons might be appointed to preach to the congregation at the parochial Mass. Healthy, expected and authoritative criticism of their first efforts at explaining the word of God to the people will prove a sure and welcome guide to future efficiency and practical sermonizing which, without it, but too often becomes an ambitious effort at declamation and a soulless exhibit of elocutionary powers.

3. We would not make it of obligation for the philosophers to wear the Roman collar for street dress, but of privilege for indoor clerical dress only. Firstly, because they are still experimenting their vocation; secondly, because we wish to reserve the Roman collar as a privilege and exclusive right of theological students, to be looked forward to by the philosophers when they are finally admitted into the theological ranks. But we would insist on theological students wearing it as street dress not only during their attendance at the seminary, but also during vacation time. We cannot understand the objection which is sometimes urged that the wearing of that honorable badge of the clergy is a check upon their liberty of action and travel during vacation. Are not they anxious to become priests? If so, and they ought to be, if they have a true vocation, is not it an honor to be entitled to the privilege of wearing the distinctive mark of the priesthood? What places do they want to frequent where they could not be seen as priests? What enjoyments do they want to partake in which a priest could not consistently share? If they have not learned at that epoch of their lives, when they aspire to be numbered among the anointed of God, to make sacrifices and to retire entirely from all worldly amusements, when will they practice self-denial? how and when will they acquire the spirit of their ecclesiastical vocation? Their pastors and clerical friends should henceforth become the constant companions and witnesses of their daily lives, and should be urged to give an unbiased and conscientious

testimony as to their behavior and constant attendance at divine service and clerical functions during the time they live away from the supervision of seminary authorities. If they do not behave as clerics during vacation time, they will not do so when they have become practically their own masters on the mission. A theologian who is not holily proud of being known everywhere as a minister of the altar does not deserve ever to become a priest; for the priest who is not anxious to be known as such will never effect the good which his sacerdotal powers enable him to do, either in public or private life.

4. We would grant two half holidays to theologians every week, and leave them free to come and go where they please, with the following restrictions: Let the first afternoon in the week be devoted to the city, each one of the seminarians being under obligation to teach one hour's catechism in one of the parochial schools of the episcopal city. With the concurrence of pastors and teachers a list could be made out of the class-rooms they have to visit and of the hour set for the lesson. The teachers should always be present, and the priests would not object to drop in occasionally during the hour's instruction. They could report upon the manner, method and success of the catechist, and thus help in forming an efficient and conscientious teacher of religion. Teaching catechism is rightly looked upon as one of the most difficult and most necessary duties of a priest's daily life, yet what training do our young clerics receive in that most important of all arts? Is it a wonder if not a few try later in life to shirk the duty, or become at least careless about it, and if not many become successful teachers of religion, since they are unable to impart interestingly to the youthful minds of the children that most necessary of all knowledge? Conducting the Sunday School classes of the parish and of the cathedral church, under the supervision of the professors and cathedral clergy, should be the privilege of the last year's theologians. Let them be free as to the disposal of the rest of the afternoon, with the understanding that they must be back in the seminary at a given hour, say 4.30 or 5 P. M.

Where will they go? That is just where you shall learn with what manner of men you have to deal; that is where the faculty will have a chance to exert its educational influence upon every one of their seminarians! There are churches to visit; sanctuaries that commend themselves to their special devotions; libraries, museums which may attract them for reference, study and investigation in special branches; an occasional visit to a friend will not be amiss. But are the seminarians not apt to abuse such privilege? Perhaps one or the other may; and if they do, the president and the professors will not have to wait long before they hear all about it. Clergy and people will take a legitimate and keen interest in the goings and comings of these young clerics. Almost unconsciously they will watch their doings, and good-natured comments upon the conduct of the seminarians and appreciation of their behaviour, of their studies and tastes, will become topics of conversation wherever the reverend professors visit, without in the least interfering with their freedom of action. If there is ever a time when a cleric is swayed by the better influences of his state of life, it is essentially during the seminary epoch; and if he cannot then behave himself as a true, gentle, sedate, serious and self-respecting man of God, will he do it later during his priestly life? And is it not better to find out his shortcomings in his inability for self-restraint during the years of his preparation for the priesthood, when he can be warned or dismissed without dishonor, than after he is irrevocably bound to a life of self-sacrifice which becomes a loathsome yoke to himself and a damning curse to his people?

Let the second afternoon of the week be devoted to short excursions in the country by threes, fours or fives, as the fancy takes them. Recommend, but do not specially enforce, occasional change of companionship, and then keep your eyes and ears open; and, reverend gentlemen of the faculty, my word for it you will know your students better, and you will have more opportunities to educate and direct them than you ever dreamed of availing yourselves of. Besides, it will give the young gentlemen self-reliance, they will be honored

by the confidence reposed in them, and they will feel themselves under great obligation to uphold their honor and the good name of the seminary and priesthood. It will be a distinct gain in manliness and healthy pride of caste, which will benefit the priesthood and the people.

5. May I venture a word on ecclesiastical chant? During my ministerial career I have met a great many priests who, having ears for everything else, yet love not the melody of our church music. They have passed through the seminary course of so-called training, but they know no more about it than if they had never heard a note in their lives. Hence, they dread the *missa cantata*, and the people who assist at it regret that they fear it not sufficiently not to inflict their attempt at singing on a long-suffering public. Is there no remedy for it? Can we hold the seminary training responsible for their irresponsiveness to melody? I think more can be done than has yet been attempted in seminaries. I would proceed as follows: From their very entrance into the seminary test all voices and divide them in two classes, viz: those who have an ear for music and those who have not. Let the first join the regular three years' course of chant and thus acquire the desirable facility to sing our wonderful hymns, antiphons, etc., so necessary in a priest. But do not lose your time with those who cannot acquire the knowledge of music, and do not exasperate their patience and your own with useless efforts. Put them at once in the class of the *incurables*, as we used to call them. Let good-lunged and long-suffering singers be detailed to din in their ears, every week, year in and year out, the same thing: the *Orations*, *Epistle*, *Gospel*, *Preface*, *Pater Noster* and *Ite missa est.* Never let up, and make them sing in season and out of season; a four years' hammering at them will fix the *air* of it in their mind; they will finally catch it, and knowing nothing else, will never let go. It is the boast of one of my old friends that no organist could ever accompany his *Ite missa est*, and it is true, for he sings it usually in about three different keys! yet it does not sound so very bad. But you may hire all the city bands to play around his church and

he will never swerve from the air which he acquired as an *incurable* in the seminary and, in his cast iron tones, he will sing very creditably the preface of a High Mass. And how important it is that mass notation should at least be decently rendered!

6. I would also urge upon our presidents of seminaries the necessity of teaching bookkeeping, and of exacting a creditable examination and fair knowledge of it from every student. Nothing very elaborate is required: simply to know how to make a credit and debit entry in a day-book, to transfer the account in well-ordered classification to a ledger, and to possess business sense enough to balance both accounts correctly so that both books tally at the end of the year, and the reverend gentleman understands and knows how church affairs are conducted and where he stands in a financial way. That is enough; but it is indispensable for the good name and the efficiency of the priest on the mission.

7. I now come to the last and most important point. According to my ideas of a seminary, Holy Orders should be conferred in them at regular intervals in accordance with the prescription of the canons. Indeed the Bishop is allowed to dispense from the *interstitia* for very grave reasons only. I would dispose them in the following order:

First year's theology, the breaking-in year of an entirely different order of studies requiring most hard work and attention, the entrance upon a very serious and responsible life which is apt to occupy and impress the mind, no Orders. Let tonsure be given at Christmas of the second year and Minor Orders at Pentecost. The obligations and privileges of the theological course are, in that way, constantly kept before the minds of the students, and keep alive a holy ambition to receive them. With the beginning of the third year's theology, divide the class in two sections on the lines of scholarship, age and conduct. The older and brighter students to be called to subdeaconship at Christmas ordinations; the second section only at Pentecost. Sound rivalry and generous ambition will encourage all to strive for the

privilege of an early ordination, thus made an honor instead of a burden. Many professors of seminaries object to this early call to Major Orders, and are the efficient cause of Sacred Orders being delayed until the end of the theological course because subdeaconship bears with it the obligation of saying the holy office, and thus entails upon the students much loss of time, necessary for their studies. I decidedly disapprove of this view of the case, for many reasons. In the first place, the bunching of all the Sacred Orders at the end of the theological course almost destroys the meaning of the various steps into which Holy Church saw fit, in her supreme wisdom, to grade the Sacrament of Holy Orders. Yet, so careful was she about this gradation, that originally, years elapsed between the conferring of the various degrees of the priesthood. Is not the present way of acting in direct antagonism to the views of Holy Church? and does it not tend to destroy the reverence of the candidates for Holy Orders for these various sacred ordinances? No wonder they cannot intelligently act as subdeacons and deacons at the solemn mass, and deem their duty done provided they remain inside the sanctuary railing! No wonder they shirk the duty of assisting at mass and impress into the sacred service students who have only just emerged from the classics, to take their place at sacred functions! No wonder they have so little respect for sacred rites, and shirk the office of subdeacon, which the very angels of God would feel honored to fill! Give your candidates to the priesthood the various Sacred Orders *gradatim;* oblige them to fill the office of each at the seminary in accordance with the directions of the rubrics, each one in turn and according to his degree, and all these abuses will come to an end. When they go home for vacation they will take a legitimate pride in filling the office to which they have been elevated during the year, at the parochial mass, to the delight and edification of their relatives and friends. And, by the way, let the old discipline of the Church be revived of announcing three Sundays in succession, in their parish Church, the pending elevation of clerical candidates to the Sacred Order of subdeaconship

with the usual prescribed monita. Good reasons exist for this discipline; the people will be edified by it, and I do not know of a single valid reason for not making these proclamations just as binding as those of the candidates for the Sacrament of Matrimony. And there are reasons why they are even more necessary, not only for subdeaconship, but for deaconship and priesthood.

As we said above, the usual objection is that seminarians cannot afford the loss of time entailed by the study of the manner of reciting the holy office and the daily recitation thereof. We answer: You must give them the time to do so. Will it be easier to learn it when, besides that duty, they have also to learn at the same time how to say holy mass and the rites of the various sacraments? Will they not learn to say the office attentively, and piously, and in good time, if they get in the habit of doing so in the seminary? Teach them to anticipate, to take the necessary time for the saying of the breviary while they are leading the orderly life of a seminarian, and they will be far more faithful to that duty of prayer than many priests are to-day. Time! Will they have more time for it when, of a sudden, they are plunged with a double burden of new and sacred duties into the holy ministry, often before they realize they are priests of God? Here they are—laymen to-day, and a week thereafter *priests!* hurried into the sacred ministry with the duty of saying the breviary, of hearing confessions, of preaching, of saying holy mass thrust upon them all inside of four days! Who can find time for all that? Is it any wonder if many get careless and hardly appreciate the *onus angelicis humeris formidandum?* Is it not a wonder that not many more get scrupulous about their duties, in that very sea of new work and multiplied difficulties which threaten to overwhelm them? Give them the time, I say, and teach them to find time for it; for if they become true priests of God, true lovers of souls, they will be far more busy in the holy ministry than they ever were in the seminary.

At Pentecost of the third year give subdeaconship to the second section of that year, and deaconship to the first.

Thus you will always have a supply of subjects for every Sacred Order, the functions and ceremonies of the Church will be carried out with more consciousness of their meaning and a feeling of right in their performance which will work unto good.

Christmas of the fourth year will then bring about the ordination to the priesthood of the first section and deaconship of the second one. In seminaries where only three years study are spent in acquiring the theological knowledge, the same order may be observed by anticipating the whole course of Orders by one ordination the first year. And thus every Order will be conferred at every ordination, and the supply of sacred ministers will be kept up.

Then again there will always be some of the newly-ordained priests residing for a time at the seminary until the Bishop stands in need of their services. And that will be quite an improvement upon the present system of forcing them in right after ordination wherever a vacancy can be made, and then during the year leaving a mission without attendance because no priest is at hand. While they quietly await the decision and call of the Bishop at the seminary, they celebrate High Mass there, prepare themselves more immediately for the sacred ministry, go and say mass at convents, asylums and prisons; they occasionally are allowed to go and help a priest who is sick or overworked; they make themselves useful in a thousand ways in the episcopal city or in the parish attached to the seminary. They get into the habit of an orderly life in the priesthood, and that is more time gained.

How much more consolation to a priest to remember such a seminary life, and how much more security in the fulfilment of his tremendous obligations, than when he has been hurried through and landed suddenly from the leading-strings of a seminary boarding-school, without responsibilities or duties of any weight, to the active and burdensome life which the mission entails?

✠ CAMILLUS P. MAES,
Bishop of Covington.

THE SCRIPTURAL ACCOUNT OF THE DISCIPLES OF EMMAUS.

OF all the apparitions of the Saviour, after His resurrection, there is none perhaps which enables us to understand better how the faith of the Apostles was strengthened, than that with which the two disciples were favored on their way to Emmaus, the evening of the very day on which Jesus had risen from the tomb.

Neither of the disciples is mentioned by name at first; later on, one of them is called Cleophas; and of him we know that he was not an Apostle. Considering only the immediate context of St. Luke (xxiv, 10, 11) we should be inclined to assume that the words "two of them" (xxiv, 10) refer to two members of the Apostolic College. Just before this passage we read of the women who had related "to the Apostles" (xxiv, 10) what they had seen at the tomb. The women, "Mary Magdalen, Joanna, Mary of James, and the others" are mentioned merely by way of parenthesis, so that the history of the disciples of Emmaus, if we regard the main connection of facts, must be connected with the statement (xxiv, 9) "And (the women) going back from the sepulchre, told all these things to the eleven, and to all the rest." It is to this last-mentioned group, "all the rest," that the two disciples belonged. One of them was, as we have seen, surely not an Apostle; the other we shall, for the time being, regard as unknown.

Both disciples set out from Jerusalem on the evening of the Resurrection. The circumstance of time has to be kept in mind. St. Luke, although he seems, for the sake of a clearer perspective, to put all the apparitions of the Saviour on the same day, obliges us, acccording to his own statement in the Acts (Chap. I, 3), to fix the Ascension forty days after the Resurrection, and place different apparitions in the interval. It is evident from the whole narrative, that the incident on the road to Emmaus occurred on the third day after the terrible Friday, and the evening of the day when the women had found the tomb empty. If St. Luke brings together in his narrative all the apparitions of our Lord, it is obviously because his purpose is, at the end of his Gospel, to sum up the proofs for the actual coming to life again of Christ.

And that which is of most value in his line of argument is not so much the time at which the apparitions successively occurred, but rather the facts of the apparitions themselves, which establish the Resurrection. In this respect, the evangelist follows the plan of the synoptic writers generally, who group all the facts of the ministry in Galilee within the space of a few months, and those of the ministry of Jerusalem in the space of a few days.

The site of Emmaus is uncertain. There existed a town called Emmaus (Nicopolis, now Amouas) one hundred and seventy-six furlongs from Jerusalem. Although from the fourth century[1] this Amouas has been identified with the Emmaus of St. Luke, the distance exceeds too greatly the limits marked by the third Gospel. We do not easily understand that the disciples, after having walked seven or eight leagues in the afternoon, should have repeated immediately the same journey; or that, reaching Jerusalem about midnight, they should have found all the disciples still gathered together, as if they had been waiting for them. Nor will it do to allege as a contrary argument the uncertainty, common enough, of the chronological indications in the Gospels; for the whole trend of the narrative suggests that the journey of the disciples was not a very long one, and that they told the apparition to the Apostles in the evening of the very day on which it had taken place. Josephus (Bell. Jud. vii, 6, 6. Antiqu. xviii, 2, 3) refers to another Emmaus nearer to Jerusalem (some manuscripts make the distance thirty furlongs, others sixty). He states that Titus had established in this locality a colony of veterans. It must be this Emmaus, and not the former, which is the village mentioned by St. Luke. Many among the moderns think that the place called to-day Kulonieh, to the northwest of Jerusalem, represents the Colonia of Titus and the

1 It was probably the only Emmaus which at this epoch enjoyed any celebrity. The writers of some of the ancient manuscripts, seemed to have taken for granted that this was the Emmaus of the Gospel, and accordingly gave the distance of Emmaus from Jerusalem as being one hundred and sixty furlongs, evidently wishing to narrow it down to a reasonable limit.

Emmaus of the Gospel. Since the Crusades, the Catholics of Palestine have identified Emmaus with Kubeibeh, on the road from Jerusalem to Jaffa. This village is found at the distance marked by St. Luke; possibly it is for this reason that they fixed upon it. The Emmaus of the Bible was likely in the neighborhood of Kulonieh.[1]

On the road to Emmaus, the two travelers conversed on the subject which filled their thoughts, discussing the bearing and the consequences of the events which had just come to pass, and also the glimmer of hope which the faithful followers of Jesus might still entertain, after having heard the strange recital of the holy women. While they were thus discoursing, Jesus Himself joined them, doubtless as a man who had come up from behind and who must have overtaken them by hastening His steps. By a special intervention of the divine power, they did not recognize their Master. Jesus, however, we may assume, had preserved the appearance in which He had conversed with men during His mortal life. It is not to a change of His features or of His ordinary apparel, or even to the dejection of the disciples that their mistake must be attributed; but to an obstacle which suspended in some inexplicable manner the normal exercise of their senses. Although the evangelist does not say so, it is plain that the disciples did not recognize the voice any more than the features of the Saviour.

Jesus joins in their conversation, asking what is the subject which seems to engross them so deeply and at the same time to sadden them.[2] Then one of them, Cleophas,[3] begins

1 The late lamented Padre Savi has proposed (REVUE BIBLIQUE, 1893, p. 227) as the site of Emmaus, the locality of *Hamoza* or *Beith-Mizza*, midway between *Kubeibeh* and *Kulonieh*, about fifty-five furlongs from Jerusalem. *Hamoza* corresponds to the Aramaic form (*Hammauza*) of the name of Emmaus.

2 Some ancient manuscripts give the reading: "And they remained sad," as if the disciples had waited some time without answering. The common reading which puts the observation in the mouth of the Saviour is confirmed by the Syriac version recently discovered at Mount Sinai. (The four Gospels in Syriac, Cambridge, 1892, p. 230.)

3 This name, abridged from Κλεόπατρος, must not be confounded with Κλωπας (John xix, 25).

to answer. He appears to have regarded Jesus as a foreign Jew who had come to Jerusalem merely for the feast of the Passover. The disciple wonders that this stranger should be ignorant of the great event of Friday, which was in the mouth of every dweller in the Holy City. Jesus asks for information. Cleophas and his companion begin to relate all that weighed upon their hearts. Of what could they be speaking except the late events regarding the prophet, Jesus of Nazareth, whom they had known, as everybody knew Him, so mighty in miraculous works, in speech so burning and so penetrating? Indeed, God and men might be appealed to as witnesses of the wonderful and beneficent character of His ministry. However, the chiefs of the Jewish people had "delivered" Him to Roman authority "to have Him condemned to die;" and they succeeded. It may be said that it is they who "crucified Him" (xxiv, 20). Thus had all the hopes which many had based upon Him been crushed. They had thought that He would deliver Israel. The disciples still speak as Jews who have not altogether renounced the idea of a national Messiah. But their hope in Jesus seems to have been shattered. This is the third day since His death and nothing has occurred to reassure them. He is surely dead! However, they have a vague knowledge or recollection of the prophecies formerly made by the Saviour concerning His own resurrection, and they had heard what the angels had said on that very morning to the holy women. They appear almost surprised that the third day has passed without bringing any change of the apparently hopeless situation. But their minds are obscured as their eyes are blinded. The evangelist does not put in their mouths any express allusion to the above-mentioned prophecies. The apostolic tradition affirms with unmistakable clearness that the resurrection of the Saviour had been for His friends an unexpected fact, and that they had never understood, before the event came actually to pass, what Jesus had said on the subject. But the incident that had taken place early in the morning of that day might, if it could be credited, augur a favorable issue. Some women who were attached to Jesus had gone to the tomb and did not

find his body; they even affirmed that they had seen angels who announced that He liveth; some men also had set out in their turn to verify the fact, found the tomb empty and saw nothing more. Could it be that Jesus is alive, as these women maintained? The disciples hardly dare to ask themselves the question, so incredible does the report seem, although the empty tomb must appear strange and unaccountable to them.

When they had finished speaking, their interlocutor began Himself to teach them. Their mind was indeed little opened to understand the prophecies, their hearts slow to confide in the divine promises. They did not comprehend that it was necessary that the Christ should suffer death in order to enter into His glory. This necessity is not founded on the idea of the Redemption, but rather on the providential exigency which brings about the fulfilment of the prophecies. If we press the letter of the discourse a little, it seems that Jesus "entered unto His glory" (xxiv, 26) at the very moment of His resurrection. The Saviour adduces at length the arguments supplied by the Scriptures;[1] namely, all the passages of the Law, of the Prophets and of the Psalms which refer to His passion and His resurrection.

The evangelist naturally had in view all the passages of the Old Testament in which the primitive Church has recognized Messianic prophecies. This reference does not represent merely a particular incident of the journey to Emmaus; it sums up likewise in a manner the whole work of Christian thought during the times which followed the resurrection, when the disciples sought in the Scriptures for

1 The phrase of the text (xxiv, 27), "And beginning from Moses and all the Prophets, He expounded to them in all the Scriptures the things that were concerning Him" seems badly construed, since Moses and the Prophets represent Scripture. We may suppose that St. Luke had for this narrative a written source wherein he read: "And beginning from Moses He expounded to them in all the Prophets that which concerned Him." Thinking of the Psalms, the evangelist may have connected the Prophets with Moses and added "in all the Scriptures." (Meyer, Weiss. *Die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas*, 8th ed. 1892, p. 656.)

arguments to support their faith and to convince or refute the Jews.

They reached Emmaus, and as Jesus acted as though He would continue His journey, the disciples offered Him hospitality. This conduct of Jesus, in which the ancient commentators saw an act of dissimulation which they deemed it necessary to explain away, is quite natural under the circumstances. The Saviour is not recognized by the disciples, and He acts toward them as a stranger. At the moment when they reach the end of their journey, He cannot have the appearance of wishing to follow them into the house which they are about to enter. He wishes to put their charity to the test. The disciples testify to their respectful kindness toward Him who had just instructed and consoled them on the journey, by inviting Him to rest beneath their roof. The invitation leads us to suppose that the disciples were not strangers in Emmaus, or that one of them at least had there his home or his family. It is, therefore, likely enough that Cleophas, the disciple mentioned in the narrative, was from Emmaus.[1] Consequently, the two disciples insist upon Jesus accepting their hospitality, and they give as reason the lateness of the hour. Jesus accedes to their request. The meal is served, and the Saviour, acting no longer as a guest, but as the head of the family, as He was accustomed to do formerly with the companions of His ministry, takes the bread, blesses it and presents it to them. At this moment, by divine permission, their eyes "are opened." The disciples recognize their Master. But, in that same instant, Jesus disappears. At the very time that the action of the Saviour recalled to their memory the thought of Him whom they loved, liberty has been restored to their senses. They had seen Jesus; Jesus was risen. The resurrection of the Saviour is now certain to the eyes of faith; it is to remain an object of faith. Christ will be, for His Church on earth, living, but invisible in human form.

1 Facilius Hieronymo crediderim, qui castelli Emmauntis quo tunc ibat (Cleophas), civem fuisse indicat. (Maldonat. in Luc. xxiv, 13.)

If we hold only to the natural meaning of the narrative we shall admit without difficulty that the evangelist has not conceived the apparition of the Saviour to His disciples as a mere vision, or a purely psychological fact. The disciples have really conversed, on the road to Emmaus, with Jesus, whom they did not recognize. The Saviour has really taken His place at table with them and given them bread. The miraculous obstacle which prevented the normal exercise of their senses is removed in one instant. They have seen the Saviour, but it has been as a flash of lightning. Jesus has ceased to be visible to them at the moment when they were assured of His presence. It is not worth while to discuss the hypothesis of Ernest Rénan, who represents the disciples at table with a pious Jew learned in Scriptures, whom they met on the road, forgetful of his presence, and imagining that Jesus is there and presents bread to them; not perceiving, during their revery that "their companion, eager to continue his journey, has left them;" and convincing themselves finally that the stranger, who has taken his leave, and the Jesus of their hallucination are one and the same person.[1] It is an admitted principle, in history and criticism, that what is affirmed without proof, contrary to the plain statement of authentic texts, may be denied without further ado.

But we do not mean to imply that our interpretation exhausts the full signification of this beautiful narrative by dwelling upon the literal, I had almost said the material, sense of the details which it contains. Many ancient interpreters have thought that Jesus, when blessing the bread and presenting it to His disciples, had renewed for them, the Eucharistic Supper. Although this opinion, taken strictly, does not seem tenable, seeing that Jesus did nothing else in this circumstance than what He was accustomed to do with His disciples, it is, nevertheless, well grounded to this extent that the remembrance of the Eucharist was certainly in the mind of the narrator, as it must likewise have presented itself to all those who knew of the apparition of Emmaus.

Christ is truly risen. The Scriptures have announced it.

1 Rénan, *Les Apôtres*, pp. 18-21.

He is truly living, He is found again "in the breaking of bread" (xviv, 36), of that mysterious bread which the community shares, and by which Jesus remains present among them, easily recognized, though invisible. The faith in the Eucharist is thus merged into the faith in the resurrection, or rather, one is based on the other. We may say that both were confirmed at the same time, and the history of the disciples of Emmaus shows us, as it were, on the spot, the work which was done in the mind of the Apostles and disciples during the first days after the resurrection. The apparition of the Saviour to the two disciples is no more an allegory or a myth than it was an hallucination; it is an historical fact, clearly demonstrated and instructive. The narrative which gives us the description of it is penetrated with a deep, dogmatic meaning; it gives us, in a simple episode, an insight into the genesis and development of faith in the resurrection among the disciples; and in the main features of the narrative we find the sacred symbol of belief in a union with Christ always living, always beloved.

Left alone, the two disciples confess that they should have recognized Jesus at once, when He was speaking to them on the way, if from nothing else than the intense emotion which filled their hearts while He was explaining to them the Scriptures. Without any further delay, they return to Jerusalem, where they find the disciples assembled with the eleven Apostles. They are told that the Lord is risen, and Simon has seen Him. They, on their part, relate what happened to them. The testimony of Peter is corroborated by that of the two disciples who have heard the Lord interpreting the Scriptures and who have recognized Him in the "breaking of bread."

Why has not the apparition of the Saviour to Simon been related by the evangelist? If the traditional text of the narrative is altogether correct, we might say that this apparition was probably recorded in the document in which was found the history of the disciples of Emmaus, and that St. Luke omitted the narrative of it because he made a choice between the traditional accounts. On the other hand, it is

not easy to understand this allusion to a fact which is not without its importance, unless the account where it is found had at one time formed part of the narrative in which the apparition of Jesus to Simon is mentioned in connection with the apparition to the disciples of Emmaus. To say that St. Luke has made this allusion on his own authority, and that, although wishing to speak of the vision of St. Peter, he knew nothing more to say on the subject but what he had derived from the first epistle to the Corinthians[1] (xv, 5)—to say that, is to make an hypothesis which is gratuitous, and all the more unlikely inasmuch as the evangelist nowhere else refers to the list of apparitions made up by St. Paul. It is hardly worth while to discuss the suggestion of Rénan that by "the vision of Peter" we might understand the incident when the Prince of the Apostles found the tomb empty on the morning of the resurrection, after having been warned by the holy women.[2] It is rather an odd thing to attribute visions to persons who have seen nothing. If Peter was favored with an apparition, he saw something more than the empty tomb.

Besides, it is not certain that the apparition which St. Luke mentions is the same as that of which St. Paul speaks. That referred to by St. Luke could have taken place only in Jerusalem, while the one referred to by St. Paul might have taken place in Galilee.

St. Mark (xxi, 7) alludes to an apparition in Galilee, referring chiefly to St. Peter, although he does not give us the details anywhere in his subsequent narrative. This apparition is doubtless some other than that which is recounted as a sort of appendix, in the last chapter of St. John, and is connected with the miraculous draught of fishes. Probably Peter, on that occasion, was not the only one who saw Jesus; but Jesus came especially to assure him. The author of the fourth Gospel, after having finished his book, complements it, so to speak, by adding the history of the miraculous

1 Brandt. *Die Evangelische Geschichte und der Ursprung des Christenthums* (Leipzig, 1893) p. 421.

2 Rénan. *Les Apôtres*, p. 12.

draught of fishes, because this narrative held an important and probably the main place in the tradition which St. Mark represents, and to which very likely the accounts of St. Paul or St. Matthew may be traced. It is noteworthy that the Apocryphal Gospel of Peter—not a very great authority, indeed, but which may well be the echo of a tradition superior to the book itself—begins the account of our Lord's apparitions by the narration of the miraculous draught of fishes.[1] The apparition in Galilee was assuredly more important than that which is referred to implicitly by St. Luke on the very day of the resurrection. But St. Luke, who intended merely to relate the apparition at Jerusalem, had no reason for introducing an apparition which took place near the Lake of Tiberias. Perhaps it is by a kind of compensation that he has related the miraculous draught of fishes with which he connects the vocation of Peter.[2]

An entirely new manner of interpreting the words "and He appeared to Simon" has been suggested lately by a learned critic, A. Resch,[3] who has emphasized the importance of the testimony of Origen as to the name of the companion of Cleophas. For Origen, in several places of his writings,[4] designates, without the slightest hesitation, the two disciples by the names Simon and Cleophas, although he does not say positively whether the Simon of whom it is question here, must be identified with Simon Peter. This fact is at least remarkable. Other ecclesiastical writers, accepting the name Simon on the authority of Origen, have expressly declared, basing their statement on the traditional text of the Gospel, that Simon, the companion of Cleophas, is not the same as the Simon who is spoken of at the end of the

1 On the Gospel of Peter, see *Enseignement Biblique*, 1893. Chronique, p. 48 and *ff.*

2 Cf. *Enseignement Biblique*, 1893, p. 111 and *ff.*

3 Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien. (Leipzig, 1895.) P. 770.

4 *In Joannem* i, 7,10. *C. Celsum* 11, 62. *In Jerem.* Hom. xxx, 3 and *ff.*

narrative, that is to say, Simon Peter.[1] As to Origen himself, he speaks just as if he had always seen in the Gospel text the name of Simon joined to that of Cleophas. There is no indication whatever that he ventured upon a mere hypothesis. It is noteworthy, however, that the passages where he mentions Simon and Cleophas are not intended as quotations from the Gospel. It cannot, therefore, be asserted that he read the name of Simon in his manuscripts of St. Luke, and we might suppose that in attributing this name to the companion of Cleophas, he simply followed a tradition. It is more probable, however, that he found the name of Simon at least in some manuscripts, and that he considered this statement as certain. Starting from this, A. Resch interprets the conclusion of the narrative (xxiv, 33–35) as follows: "And they (Simon Peter and Cleophas) rose up at the same hour and went back to Jerusalem, and they found the eleven gathered together and those that were with them, saying: 'The Lord is risen indeed, and has appeared to Simon.' And they told what things were done in the way, and how they knew Him in the breaking of bread." It is the disciples of Emmaus who announce to the others that Jesus is risen, since He appeared to Simon, seeing that the apparition is thought to have been for him. And then they relate the various incidents of the apparition. But it may be said: The eleven were no longer eleven, when Peter was absent. And could he say, as though he were speaking of another: "The Lord has appeared to Simon?" The first objection has hardly any force; the "eleven" designates the Apostles in general, even if one be wanting. St. Paul uses in the same way the word "twelve" (1 Cor. xv, 5). The second objection is more embarrassing. To escape it we must suppose that it is Cleophas who says: "The Lord has appeared to Simon." Cleophas would speak thus because, to

1 St. Ambrose in several places of his writings (see notably Apol. David ii, 8, 43) calls the two disciples Ammaon and Cleophas. The influence of Origen upon St. Ambrose seems to be unquestionable; but the change of Simon into Ammaon shows still another influence, that of the manuscripts of the ancient Vulgate, where the name of Emmaus has been applied to the disciple. C. F. Tischendorf, N. Test. graece, ed. 8th crit. major. i, 725.

his mind, Jesus appeared principally for the sake of Peter. This explanation, although not forced, could not be said to commend itself to the unbiassed mind, except for the fact that it presents a real advantage to the exegete of the passage in question. There is no longer any need to assume that the incident which the evangelist hinted at was an apparition of the Saviour to Simon; and the narrative no longer contains any allusion to a fact which has not been already related. According to the ordinary reading of the text the assembly affirm energetically their faith in the resurrection: a few moments later the same disciples, when Jesus appears to them, apparently unmindful of their previous avowal of faith, imagine that they see a spirit. This impression of the disciples can be explained. But how much more harmonious is the connection of the narratives if we assume that the two disciples inform the others of the resurrection of Jesus, without as yet altogether forcing the conviction of their hearers. And this is seemingly the state of affairs which the closing verse of St. Mark supposes. In fact, we read in the passage which sums up the history of the disciples of Emmaus (Mark xvi, 12-13): "And afterward He appeared in another form to two of them, walking, as they were going into the country; and they going told it to the rest; neither did any believe it." These arguments are not to be despised. It is hardly necessary to say that if St. Peter was at Emmaus, the apparition to Peter, of which Paul speaks, would not be an apparition in Galilee, but the apparition in Emmaus.

The hypothesis of Resch, however, is far from being demonstrated. I have mentioned it here because it comes from a candid critic and is not altogether destitute of probability. But Origen cannot outweigh all the other witnesses to the text. This is why, for my part, I stand by the traditional form of the narrative, and would be inclined to maintain the views which I have advanced above.

ALFRED LOISY,
Anc. Prof. d'Ecrit. Sainte à l'Université de Paris.
Neuilly, France.

ANALECTA.

E. S. CONGREGATIONE EPISCOPORUM ET REGULARIUM.

DUBIA DE CLERICIS IN SACRIS CONSTITUTIS QUI EX CLAUSTRO DIMISSI SUNT.

I.

Eme. ac Rme. Domine.

Episcopus Abulensis exponit quae sequuntur :

Ex decreto *Auctis admodum* istius Sacrae Congregationis diei 4 Novembris 1892 sancitum fuit : alumnos votorum solemnium vel simplicium tam perpetuorum, quam temporalium, in Sacris constitutos, qui expulsi vel dimissi fuerint, perpetuo suspensos mansuros, donec a Sancta Sede alio modo eis consulatur, ac praeterea Episcopum benevolum receptorem invenerint, et de patrimonio ecclesiastico sibi providerint; alumnos vero, qui sponte ab Apostolica Sede dimissionem petierint et obtinuerint, ex claustro non egressuros donec Episcopum benevolum receptorem invenerint, et de ecclesiastico patrimonio sibi providerint ; secus ab ordinum susceptorum exercitio suspensos esse mansuros.

Circa interpretationem vero hujus Decreti hac in parte quaedam oborta sunt dubia, quae reverenter V. E. sapientiae subjicit.

1^{um} : Utrum haec verba *Episcopum benevolum receptorem invenerint et de patrimonio ecclesiastico sibi providerint*, ita collective sint intelligenda, ut ad tollendam suspensionem ambo sint necessaria, nempe, et Episcopum benevolum receptorem invenire, et patrimonium ecclesiasticum constituere, vel sufficiat tantum Episcopum benevolum receptorem invenire?

2^{um} : Utrum haec, quae in numero 5° leguntur, *secus suspensi maneant ab exercitio susceptorum ordinum*, ita sint sumenda, ut religiosus, qui obtenta Apostolica licentia e claustro exierit, quin prius Episcopum benevolum receptorem invenerit vel de patrimonio ecclesiastico sibi providerit, sit suspensus tantum donec ab Apostolica Sede suspensio tollatur, invento Episcopo benevolo receptore et patrimonio ecclesiastico constituto ?

Quare, etc.

Sacra Congregatio Emorum. ac Rmorum. S. R. E. Cardinalium negotiis et consultationibus Episcoporum et Regularium praeposita, omnibus mature perpensis respondendum censuit prout respondet, ad primum dubium ; *affirmative* ad primam partem, *negative* ad secundam. Ad secundum, *affirmative* pariter ad primam partem ; *negative*, ad secundam.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria Sacrae Congregationis Episcoporum et Regularium hac die 20 Novembris 1895.

J. *Card.* VERGA, *Praefectus.*

A. TROMBETTA, *Pro Secretarius.*

II.

Bme. Pater.

Joannes, Episcopus Abulensis, ad pedes Sanctitatis Vestrae humiliter provolutus, ea, quae sequuntur, exponit.

Sunt in hac Dioecesi aliqui alumni Institutorum religiosorum in Sacris constituti, alii expulsi, alii ab Apostolica Sede dimissione obtenta, ex claustro egressi, sed quin prius benevolum Episcopum receptorem invenissent, nec de ecclesiastico patrimonio sibi providissent. Ex Decreto *Auctis admodum* Sacrae Congregationis Episcoporum et Regularium diei 4 Novembris 1892, primi perpetuo suspensi manebunt, donec a Sancta Sede alio modo eis consulatur, ac praeterea Episcopum benevolum receptorem invenerint, et de ecclesiastico patrimonio sibi providerint ; secundi vero etiam ab ordinum susceptorum exercitio suspensi erunt. Episcopus Orator ob Cleri saecularis sufficientem copiam, aliisque justis de causis, Episcopus benevolus receptor horum alumnorum esse nequit ; sed de eorumdem miserrima vita, angustissimaque conditione maxime dolet et eorumdem supplicationibus quotidie torquetur. Unus ex illis jam Presbyter, in agrariis laboribus occupatus, victum sibi comparat. Exoptans Episcopus Orator aliquid praedictis alumnis levaminis afferre, quin onera Episcopi benevoli receptoris in se suscipiat, Sanctitati Vestrae sequentia dubia pro solutione reverenter submittit.

1^um^ An possit praedictis alumnis licentiam concedere ut Ordinem exercere valeant sed ad nutum suum, uti mos est concedere clericis alienae Dioecesis ad tempus hic commorantibus, quin onera Episcopi benevoli receptoris in se suscipiat ?

2um Et quatenus negative, quid faciendum cum his miseris clericis, qui nec Episcopum benevolum receptorem inveniunt, nec patrimonium ecclesiasticum sibi constituere possunt?

Et Deus, etc.

Ad primum dubium Sacra Congregatio Emorum. ac Rmorum. S. R. E. Cardinalium, negotiis et consultationibus Episcoporum et Regularium praeposita respondendum censuit, uti respondet; "Prout exponitur, *negative*." Sed eadem Sacra Congregatio facultatem tribuit Episcopo Abulensi, quatenus nihil aliud sibi obstet, permittendi praefatis alumnis Sacros Ordines exercere ad tempus sibi benevisum, donec maneant in sua Dioecesi, firma obligatione sibi inveniendi Episcopum benevolum receptorem et constituendi sibi sacrum patrimonium ad formam Decreti *Auctis admodum* aut Rescriptorum Sacrae Congregationis, si quae obtinuerint; ad secundum, *provisum in primo*.

Romae 20 Novembris 1895.

J. *Card.* VERGA, *Praefectus.*
A. TROMBETTA, *Pro-Secretarius.*

E. S. CONGREGATIONE RITUUM.

I.

INDULTUM PRO USU SACRORUM OLEORUM.

Instante Rmo Dño Episcopo Anneciensi, ut in universis Paroeciis suae Dioeceseos, de Apostolica Venia permittatur usus sacrorum Oleorum, anno praecedente benedictorum, usque ad Sabbatum ante Pentecosten exclusive, ne eo tempore absint a propriis Paroeciis Rectores vel Vicarii, quorum ministerio Christifideles egent: S. R. Congregatio referente subscripto Secretario, iuxta votum Commissionis Liturgicae, rescribendum censuit: "Parochus curet, ut Presbyter, vel Clericus, si possible sit in Sacris constitutus, nova Olea Sacra recipiat. Quod si aliquod adhuc extet impedimentum, idem Parochus vel per se vel per alium Sacerdotem benedicat fontem sine sacrorum Oleorum infusione, quae privatim opportuno tempore fiet: nisi aliquem baptizare debeat, tunc enim in ipsa benedictione solemni vetera Olea infundat." Atque ita servari mandavit.—Die 31 Ianuarii 1896.

CAI. *Card.* ALOISI-MASELLA, *S.R.C. Praef.*
L. ✠ S. A. TRIPEPI, *Secretarius.*

II.

PRECES IN LINGUA VERNACULA INTRA MISSAM PRIVATAM.

Rector Parochialis Ecclesiae loci vulgo *Ozieri*, intra fines Dioeceseos Bisarchien. in Sardinia, de consensu sui Rmi Episcopi, a Sacra Rituum Congregatione sequentis Dubii solutionem humillime postulavit, nimirum :

"An in eadem Parochiali Ecclesia a fidelibus intra Missam cani possint iuxta antiquum morem, a nonnullis annis interruptum, preces vel hymni lingua vernacula compositi in honorem Sancti vel Mysterii, cuius festum agitur?"

Sacra porro Rituum Congregatio, referente subscripto Secretario, atque exquisito voto Commissionis Liturgicae, rescribendum censuit :

Affirmative de consensu Ordinarii quoad Missam privatam : *Negative* quoad Missam solemnem sive cantatam iuxta Ordinationis pro Musica Sacra Articulum septimum et octavum ; non obstante Decreto die 21 Iunii 1879 dato et aliis quibuscumque.

Atque ita servari mandavit.—Die 31 Ian. 1896.

CAI. *Card.* ALOISI-MASELLA, *S.R.C. Praef.*

L. ✠ S. A. TRIPEPI, *Secretarius.*

III.

DECRETUM GENERALE ANNIVERSARII DEDICATIONIS ECCLESIAE.

Ad omnes in posterum controversias circa Anniversarium Dedicationis Ecclesiae penitus evellendas, S. R. C. in Comitiis pro nova Collectione authentica Decretorum evulganda, subsignata die ad Vaticanum habitis, statuit ac declaravit : I. Dedicationem Ecclesiae, eiusque proinde Anniversarium, esse festum Domini. II. Hinc Ecclesiae propriae Anniversarium, iuxta Rubricas solemnius et primarium aliis quibuscumque locorum festis etiam Patroni aut Titularis, esse per se praeferendum, tam in occursu quam in concursu ; permitti nihilominus, ut Patroni festum, cuiuscumque sit personalis dignitatis, ratione feriationis praedicto Anniversario praeferatur. III. Anniversarium vero Dedicationis Ecclesiae non propriae, uti secundarium habendum esse, et si cum aliis quibuscumque festis occurrat vel concurrat, servandas esse Rubricas et Decretum Gen. super primariis et secundariis festis. IV. Eiusdem autem

Dedicationis Ecclesiae, sive propriae sive non propriae, Anniversario occurrente vel concurrente cum festis solemnioribus universalis Ecclesiae, haec semper illi praevalere, personali etiam dignitate posthabita, iuxta Rubricas. V. Quamvis fixa esse debeat illa dies anniversaria Dedicationis Ecclesiae, quae infra annum a consecratione recurrit; nihilominus Episcopo Ecclesiam consecranti jus inhaerere, iuxta Decreta alias edita, aliam diem fixam, vel etiam Dominicam, dummodo in consecrationis actu, seligendi pro illius Anniversario quotannis solemnius celebrando: exceptis duplicibus primae et secundae classis universalis Ecclesiae, nec non quibuscumque Dominicis privilegiatis, et duplicibus primae classis Ecclesiarum particularium. Atque ita servari mandavit.

Die 4 Februarii 1896.

CAI. *Card.* ALOISI-MASELLA, *S.R.C. Praef.*

L. ✠ S. A. TRIPEPI, *Secretarius.*

IV.

DUBIA.—CIRCA OCTAVAM FESTORUM.

Quidam Sacrarum Caeremoniarum Magistri, quibus Kalendaria particularia disponere commissum est, Sacram Rituum Congregationem pro insequentium Dubiorum resolutione humiliter rogarunt; nimirum:

I. An dies infra Octavam Festi primarii vel secundarii cedant semiduplici occurrenti?

II. Utrum dies Octava sequatur rationem sui Festi primarii vel secundarii?

Et Sacra Congregatio, referente subscripto Secretario, et audito voto Commissionis Liturgicae, omnibus rite perpensis, rescribendum censuit:

Ad I. Dies infra Octavam quamcumque tanquam secundarios habendos esse, et cedere cuicumque semiduplici occurrenti.

Ad II. *Affirmative*, nempe: Diem Octavam esse primariam vel secundariam, prouti Festum, ad quod illa pertinet, primarium vel secundarium est.

Atque ita rescripsit, Die 21 Februarii 1896.

CAI. *Card.* ALOISI-MASELLA, *S.R.C. Praef.*

L. ✠ S. ALOISIUS TRIPEPI, *Secretarius.*

V.

VARIA SOLVUNTUR DUBIA.

R. Dñus Iosephus Precerutti, Dioeceseos Viglevanensis, cui munus incumbit redigendi quotannis Kalendarium Dioecesanum, de consensu sui Rmi Ordinarii, a Sacrorum Rituum Congregatione insequentium Dubiorum solutionem enixe flagitavit, nimirum ;

I. In Kalendario Dioeceseos Viglevanensis non raro occurrunt eadem die duo festa primaria, vel duo secundaria, eiusdem ritus et classis, sed diversae dignitatis, quorum unum est mobile, alterum affixum diei mensis : quaeritur cuinam festo in hisce casibus competat praecedentia ?

II. Quid agendum de festo Dedicationis Basilicarum Ss. Petri et Pauli Apost., perpetuo impedito in Kalendario Dioecesano, cum ei locus non suppetat ?

III. Ex Litteris Apostolicis in forma Brevis Pii Papae VI, in Dioecesi Viglevanen. et aliis Dioecesibus Pedemontanis, die decimaquinta Januarii celebratur festum Translationis Reliquiarum Sancti Mauritii Martyris, Patroni Principalis Pedemontii, sub ritu duplici primae classis cum Octava ; quum vero die 22 Septembris agatur festum Sancti Mauritii et Soc. Mm., sub ritu duplici maiori, quaeritur, an hoc alterum festum habendum sit tanquam primarium in casu ?

IV. In Ecclesiis Parochialibus nullam habentibus Chori obligationem, et in quibus tamen decantantur Vesperae diebus festivis absque Completorio, ipsae Vesperae in festo Purificationis B. Mariae Virginis concludendae sunt cum Antiphona : *Alma Redemptoris Mater*, vel cum altera : *Ave Regina Coelorum ?*

V. An servari possit immemorabilis consuetudo, qua in Officiis Defunctorum, quae peraguntur infra annum cum aliqua solemnitate, praesertim diebus obitus et anniversariis, semper decantetur primum Nocturnum cum Laudibus recitatis, non omisso cantu Invitatorii : *Venite, exultemus ?*

Sacra autem Rituum Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, equisita Commissionis Liturgicae sententia, reque mature perpensa, respondendum censuit :

Ad I. Ex duobus festis primariis aut secundariis eiusdem ritus et classis, praecedentia competit digniori : in paritate vero dignitatis, competit festo, diei mensis affixo.

Ad II. Festum, de quo agitur, ex communi lege ad instar simplicis perpetuo redigendum foret : verum de speciali gratia, repo-

natur prima die, a duplici minore libera, et festum semiduplex fiat simplex.

Ad III. *Affirmative.*

Ad IV. *Affirmative* ad primam partem: *Negative* ad secundam.

Ad V. Serventur Rubricae Ritualis et Breviarii Romani.

Atque ita rescripsit et servari mandavit. Die 21 Februarii 1896.

CAI. *Card.* ALOISI-MASELLA, *S. R. C. Praef.*

L. ✠ S. ALOISIUS TRIPEPI, *Secretarius.*

VI.

FESTUM B. ANTONII MARIAE ZACCARIA FUNDATORIS BARNABITARUM, ELEVATUR AD RIT. DUPL. 2ae CLASSIS PRO UNIVERSA CONGREGATIONE BARNABITARUM.

Aucto in dies cultu, novisque editis pietatis incrementis erga Beatum ANTONIUM MARIAM ZACCARIA Clericorum Regularium S. Pauli Barnabitarum nec non Monialium Angelicarum fundatorem; Rmus P. Procurator Generalis ipsiusmet Congregationis communia vota depromens, SSmum Dñum Nostrum LEONEM PAPAM XIII enixis precibus rogavit, ut Festum ipsius Beati sui Institutoris pro universa eadem Congregatione a duplici maiori ad ritum duplicem secundae Classis elevare dignaretur.

Sanctitas porro Sua, has preces a me infrascripto Cardinali Sacrorum Rituum Congregationi Praefecto relatas peramanter excipiens, de speciali gratia, petitam ritus elevationem benigne indulgere dignata est; servatis Rubricis.

Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Die 27 Ianuarii 1896.

CAI. *Card.* ALOISI-MASELLA, *Praef.*

L. ✠ S. A. TRIPEPI, *Secretarius.*

VII.

RITUS BENEDICTIONIS ET IMPOSITIONIS SACRI NUMISMATIS IMMAC. MARIAE VIRG. CONCEPTIONIS.

Sacerdos benedicturus Sacrum Numisma Immaculatae Virginis Mariae Conceptionis, superpelliceo et stola indutus absolute incipit:

V. Adiutorium nostrum in nomine Domini.

R. Qui fecit coelum et terram.
V. Dominus vobiscum.
R. Et cum spiritu tuo.

OREMUS.—Omnipotens et misericors Deus qui per multiplices Immaculatae Mariae Virginis apparitiones in terris mirabilia iugiter pro animarum salute operari dignatus es, super hoc numismatis signum, tuam benedictionem benignus infunde, ut pie hoc recolentes ac devote gestantes, et illius patrocinium sentiant et tuam misericordiam consequantur. Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

Deinde Numisma aspergit aqua benedicta, et ipsum postea imponens dicit:

Accipe sanctum Numisma, gesta fideliter, et digna veneratione prosequere: ut piissima et immaculata caelorum Domina te protegat atque defendat; et pietatis suae prodigia renovans, quae a Deo suppliciter postulaveris tibi misericorditer impetret, ut vivens et moriens in materno eius amplexu feliciter requiescas. Amen.

Vel si sint plures:

Accipite sanctum Numisma, gestate fideliter, et digna veneratione prosequimini: ut piissima et immaculata caelorum Domina vos protegat atque defendat; et pietatis suae prodigia renovans quae a Deo suppliciter postulaveritis vobis misericorditer impetret, ut viventes ac morientes in materno eius amplexu feliciter requiescatis. Amen.

Inde prosequitur:

Kyrie, eleison. Christe, eleison. Kyrie, eleison.
Pater noster . . .
V. Et ne nos inducas in tentationem.
R. Sed libera nos a malo.
V. Regina sine labe originali concepta.
R. Ora pro nobis.
V. Domine, exaudi orationem meam,
R. Et clamor meus ad te veniat.
V. Dominus vobiscum.
R. Et cum spiritu tuo.

OREMUS.—Domine Iesu Christe, qui beatissimam Virginem Mariam matrem tuam ab origine immaculatam innumeris miraculis clarescere voluisti: concede ut eiusdem patrocinium semper implorantes, gaudia consequamur aeterna. Qui vivis et regnas in saecula saeculorum. Amen. (19 Apr. 1895.)

E. S. CONGREGATIONE INDULGENTIARUM.

I.

INDULGENTIAE IN FAVOREM PII OPERIS S. THOMAE AQUINATIS.

Beatissime Pater :

Franciscus Benjamin Cardinalis Richard Archiepiscopus Parisiensis, S. V. humiliter exponit : Nuper canonice erectum esse in hac Dioecesi Parisiensi sub nomine et invocatione Divi Thomae Aquinatis, Catholicarum scholarum Patroni, pium opus ad colligendas fidelium eleemosynas in favorem et commodum Catholicae Universitatis Parisiensis quae a triginta duabus dioecesibus fundata est et sustentatur. Hujus autem operis haec ratio est, ut in singulis hisce dioecesibus, dirigente quodam presbytero rite delegato, plures instituantur zelatores vel zelatrices quorum munus erit annuas eleemosynas colligendi et ad dioecesanum Directorem transmittendi. Ut vero opus hujusmodi tam necessarium incrementum in dies accipiat, a S. V. enixis precibus implorat prefatus Orator sequentium Indulgentiarum concessionem.

1. Christifidelibus utriusque sexus qui in favorem Universitatis Parisiensis annuam stipem vel fundaverint semel soluta pecunia, vel singulis annis erogaverint, item et zelatoribus et zelatricibus qui eleemosynas colligerint, Plenariam Indulgentiam solitis conditionibus Confessionis, Communionis et Visitationis alicujus Ecclesiae vel oratorii publici, et orationis effundendae ad mentem Sanctitatis Vestrae, quotannis lucrandam :

(*a*) Die festo Omnium Sanctorum, quo celebrato aperiuntur scholae ;

(*b*) Die 8 decembris (vel Dominica illa in qua alicubi fit exterior solemnitas) festo Immaculatae Conceptionis B. M. V., Instituti catholici Patronae principalis ;

(*c*) Die 7 martii, in festo S. Thomae Aq. Scholarum catholicarum patroni ;

(*d*) Die 19 martii, in festo S. Joseph, quo titulari gaudet Ecclesia Instituti catholici Parisiensis ;

(*e*) Die 29 junii (vel dominica in qua fit exterior solemnitas) in festo BB. App. Petri et Pauli, Instituti catholici Parisiensis Patronorum minus principalium ;

(*f*) In festo SS. Cordis D. N. I. C.

(*g*) Demum in articulo mortis, si christifideles eidem pio operi addicti, vere poenitentes, confessi ac S. Synaxi refecti vel saltem

contriti SSmum Iesu Nomen ore, sin minus corde, devote invocaverint, et mortem uti peccati stipendium de manu Domini patienter susceperint.

2. Item Christifidelibus et zelatoribus ac zelatricibus partialem indulgentiam *bis centum* dierum, semel in die, si Ecclesiam S. Ioseph Instituti catholici propriam, hi visitaverint et juxta mentem S. V., necnon ad operis incrementum aliquas preces effuderint.

3. Tandem, presbyteris, qui ad opus propagandum curam impendunt, favorem altaris privilegiati personalis ter in hebdomada pro missis, quae ab iisdem in suffragium defunctorum celebrabuntur, dummodo tamen simile indultum pro alia die non obtinuerint.

Et Deus.

S. Congregatio Indulgentiis sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita, utendo facultatibus a SSmo D. N. Leone PP. XIII sibi specialiter tributis, benigne annuit pro gratia in omnibus juxta preces. Praesenti *ad decennium* valituro absque ulla Brevis expeditione. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus. Datum Romae, ex Secretaria ejusdem S. Congregationis, die 10 junii 1895.

FR. IGNATIUS *Card.* PERSICO, *Praef.*
A. *Archiepus* NICOPOLITAN., *Secretarius.*

II.

QUANDO RENOVANTUR STATIONES VIAE CRUCIS, SUFFICIT NOVA BENEDICTIO.

Fr. Raphael ab Aureliaco Procurator Generalis Ordinis Minorum, H. S. Congregationi sequentia humiliter exposuit :

Pro legitima Stationum Viae Crucis erectione, Sancta Sedes plura sapienter constituit observanda sub poena nullitatis. Nam statuit " quod in erigendis hujusmodi Stationibus, tam Sacerdotis erigentis deputatio ac Superioris localis consensus, quam respectivi Ordinarii, vel Antistitis, et parochi, necnon Superiorum Ecclesiae, Monasterii, Hospitalis et Loci Pii, ubi ejusmodi erectio fieri contigerit, deputatio, consensus et licentia, in scriptis et non aliter expediri, et quandocumque opus fuerit, exhiberi debeant, sub poena nullitatis ipsiusmet erectionis ipso facto incurrendae."

Modo Orator petit a S. Congne solutionem dubii sequentis :

Utrum in casu quo, ob Crucium vetustatem vel ob aliam justam

causam, renovari debeant Stationes Viae Crucis in eadem Ecclesia, sive Oratorio, in quo rite cum omnibus documentis ut supra a S. Sede praescriptis erectae reperiebantur, praefata omnia et singula documenta denuo sive oretenus sive in scriptis postulanda sint; vel sufficiat tantummodo novarum Stationum benedictio a Sacerdote legitimo ad id deputato?

Romae ad S. Antonium 6 Jan. 1896.

S. Congr. Indulgentiis Sacrisque Relquiis praeposita relato dubio respondit die 11 Jan. 1896.

Negative quoad 1^m^ partem; quoad 2^m^ sufficere tantummodo novarum erectionum benedictionem.

Datum Romae, e Secretaria ejusdem S. Congnis die et anno ut supra.

ANDREAS *Card.* STEINHUBER, *Praef.*
A. *Archiep.* NICOP. *Secretarius.*

III.

ORATIUNCULA INDULGENTIIS DITATUR IN FAVOREM SUPERIORUM ORDINIS MINORUM S. FRANCISCI.

Beatissime Pater:

Fr. Raphaël ab Aureliaco, Procurator Glis Ordinis Minorum S. Francisci, ad pedes S. V. humillime provolutus, enixe exorat Indulgentiam tercentum dierum lucrandam a Superioribus ejusdem Ordinis recitantibus sequentem orationem, spiritu seraphico S. P. Francisci revera dignam, et indulgentiam plenariam semel in mense pro omnibus Superioribus qui singulis diebus eamdem oratiunculam recitaverint, declarando utramque praefatam Indulgentiam esse animabus in Purgatorio detentis applicabilem. Pro qua gratia.

ORATIO SUPERIORUM

juxta mentem Sancti Francisci.

"Da mihi, DOMINE, affabilem esse minoribus et tanta benevolentia praeditum ut meo affectui non vereantur se committere delinquentes. Fac quaeso, ut sim moderatus in praeceptis, propitius in offensis, feram magis peccatores quam inferam injurias. Hostis sim vitiis, medicus vitiosis, talis denique sit vita mea quae ceteris fiat spectaculum disciplinae. Per CHRISTUM," etc.

S. Congregatio Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita, utendo facultatibus a SS. D. N. LEONE Pp. XIII sibi specialiter tributis benigne concessit Indulgentiam defunctis quoque applicabilem, *centum* tantummodo dierum semel in die lucrandam ab omnibus alumnis Ordinis Min. S. Francisci Assisiensis, qui in eodem Ordine Moderatorum munere fungentes supraposítam oratiunculam corde saltem contrito ac devote recitaverint. Praesenti *in perpetuum* valituro absque Brevis expeditione.

Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

Datum Romae, ex Secretaria ejusdem S. Congregationis die 3 Februarii 1896.

A. *Card.* STEINHUBER, *Praef.*

L. ✠ S. † A. *Archiep.* NICOPOLITAN., *Secret.*

E S. POENITENTIARIA APOST.

DE JURE PATRISFAMILIAS QUOAD ABSTINENTIAM.

Quatenus paterfamilias fruatur indulto carnes comedendi in diebus prohibitis, et nequeat aut nolit duo facere prandia, valeant carnes edere etiam alii, ceu sunt filii et filiae, avus et ava, et personae eius addictae servitio.

R. Personis quae sunt in potestate patrisfamilias, cui facta est legitima facultas edendi carnes, permitti uti cibis patrifamilias indultis, adiecta conditione iis, qui ieiunare tenentur, de unica comestione et de non permiscendis.[1]—(*S. Poenitent. Ap.* 16 Jan. 1834.)

1. Eadem S. Poenitentiaria cum quaereretur utrum patresfamilias, cum in familia adest aliquis a lege abstinentiae a carnibus dispensatus, dispensationem ad omnes ex familia indiscriminatim extendere possint, respondit (10 Ian. 1834): "Infirmitatem, et aliud quodcumque rationabile impedimentum, de utriusque medici consilio, non vero gulam, avaritiam, sive generatim expensarum compendium, eximere posse a praecepto abstinentiae in diebus esurialibus" Et ad quaesitum: "An ratio propter quam filiifamilias uti possunt cibis vetitis a patrefamilias exhibitis, sit eorum impotentia physica sive moralis observandi praeceptum; seu potius indultum quo gaudet paterfamilias;" respondit (29 Dec. 1862): "Ratio permissionis de qua in quaesito proposito sermo, non est indultum patrisfamilias, sed impotentia in qua versantur filiifamilias observandi praeceptum."

CONFERENCES.

THE LATE DECREE REGARDING THE SECRET SOCIETIES OF "ODD FELLOWS," "KNIGHTS OF PYTHIAS" AND "SONS OF TEMPERANCE."

About eight months ago the Apostolic Delegate communicated to the Bishops of the United States an *Instruction*[1] of the S. Congregation received from Cardinal Monaco, which imposed the following obligation: All the Ordinaries in the United States are to use their utmost endeavors to restrain the faithful from joining the societies of the so-called "Odd Fellows," "Knights of Pythias" and "Sons of Temperance;" and they are to inform the faithful of this restriction. Catholics who, being advised of the obligation, persist in their attachment to said societies, and are unwilling to sever their actual connection with them, *are not to be admitted to the reception of the Sacraments.*[2]

From a letter published under date of February 13th of this year, for the information of the Ordinaries and Clergy of the United States, by Mgr. D. Sbaretti, *Auditor* of the Apostolic Delegation, and *Pro-Delegate*, we learn that, according to "Instructions" received under date of August 13, 1895, it was also made known to our Bishops "*that the condemnation was to be considered absolute, and wherever peculiar circumstances seemed to merit special consideration in particular*

1 See AM. ECCL. REVIEW, July, 1895, p. 67.

2 "Cunctis per istas regiones Ordinariis esse omnino connitendum, ut fideles a tribus Societatibus praedictis et ab unaquaque earum arceantur; eaque de re ipsos fideles esse monendos; et si monitione insuper habita, velint adhuc eisdem Societatibus adhaerere, nec ab illis cum effectu separari, a perceptione Sacramentorum esse arcendos."—*Litt. ad Ill. ac Rm. F. Satolli, Del. Ap.* d. 20 Aug. 1894. The date of this Decree puts it a year ahead of its publication, which leads us to assume that the matter was held in consideration for that length of time, although a definite decision had been arrived at.

cases, the matter was to be referred by the Ordinary to Rome."

The S. Congregation allowed, therefore, that there were possibly exceptional cases in which the extent of the application of the Decree, which is in its nature *absolute*, might have to be determined by judicial decision. Indeed, the past indecision on the part of some of our Bishops as to whether the societies in question had been either forbidden or excommunicated, or both, by the Baltimore Decrees[1] may have induced many Catholics to join or to remain attached to associations which held out to them numerous, and, from a temporal point of view, important advantages.

But the judicial decision in such cases was not to rest with the individual confessor or pastor, or even with the Ordinary of the diocese. Every case of doubt as to the extent to which the Decree of excommunication applied in particular cases was to be referred to the S. Congregation.

Such was the condition of things up to the beginning of the present year, when a number of prelates sent a petition to the S. Congregation at Rome, which elicited a definite answer as to the precise extent of the application of the Decree in regard to persons who were willing to sever their connection with the secret society, but who had rights in equity to certain temporal advantages offered by the association in view of a mutual contract.

The reply of the S. Congregation to this query contains three elements:

I. A scheme of *conditions* which must be verified in each case before application for a judicial decision can be made.

II. The *limits*, in all cases, of the decision itself.

III. The *privilege of making application* for a decision (within the assigned limits) *to the Apostolic Delegation.*

The Decree sets forth that: Members of the three societies, or of any one of them, cannot be absolved unless they *absolutely* renounce their adherence to the forbidden societies.

1 See Archbishop Katzer's article on the subject, April, 1892, of the AM. ECCL. REVIEW, Vol. VI, p. 241.

This renunciation must be complete, external and in conscience; for the aim and methods of these societies are known to be dangerous to religion and society, although their members may not be individually conscious of this fact.

Since, however, besides their leading aims, which are for the most part a matter of secrecy, these societies have for their secondary object mutual assistance in temporal things, the question arises whether a member, who, having joined the association in good faith, has given his share toward the accumulation of a beneficial fund, a proportionate part of which was to be returned to him or his family with just interest, either as savings or as relief money in case of sickness or death—whether such a member must so far renounce his connection with the society as to sustain a serious and, perchance, unjust loss.

The S. Congregation answers: In general, a loss of this kind is no valid reason for not withdrawing one's name from the society. The cause of this decision is plain. Practically it is impossible for a man to retain *nominal* connection with a society without either *furthering its main object*—though unwillingly and unconsciously—or else *giving* scandal to those who do not, or cannot, know the true reasons of his remaining a *nominal* member, and assume that such membership means practical co-operation in the entire end and purpose of the society.

Nevertheless, there may be cases—though they must of necessity be rare—where (1) there exists no active co-operation; (2) in which at the same time there is no danger of giving actual scandal; (3) where the person himself had joined the society in good faith, not knowing that it was forbidden; (4) where the loss sustained by the withdrawal is of a serious nature; (5) while there is no danger that the temporal interests involved constitute an occasion of turning the penitent or the members of his family from the true faith; in short, *where all these conditions are verified in one case*, the confessor, or pastor, or bishop has sufficient cause for making application in order to obtain permission to give absolution to a person who allows his name to remain on

the membership-list of the society for the purpose of holding a sort of legal title to certain temporary benefits toward the creation of which he has advanced money. Similar cases would be those in which a person has borrowed money from a society on mortgage, to be repaid by instalments, or in form of dues; or where he holds securities which become worthless by his withdrawal from the society, etc., etc.

In such cases the Apostolic Delegate is empowered, according to his judgment of the case, to allow a mere *nominal* membership to continue for the sole purpose of securing for the applicant an external title to what really belongs to him, or to shield him from an injury the avoidance of which does not in any way identify him with the doubtful and dangerous character of the society from a moral point of view.

THE DEAF-MUTES' INSTITUTE AT CHINCHUBA.

In the excellent article on the "Education of Catholic Deaf-Mutes" in the April number of the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW no mention is made of the *School Sisters of Notre Dame*, of Milwaukee, Wis., who are in charge of the Deaf-Mute Institution of the H. Rosary at Chinchuba, La.

All you say about the generous, noble-hearted Canon Mignot is perfectly correct, but the School Sisters of Notre Dame also deserve an honorable mention.

The Institution had been commenced by another community, but could not be kept up by the same. The Most Rev. Archbishop of New Orleans appealed to the late lamented Mother Caroline, who, on her death-bed, accepted the charge of Chinchuba as the very last of her numerous works of charity. We at once engaged a very competent professor from St. John's Institute to initiate some young well-chosen Sisters in this, for us, new field of educational work. As to their success, we have had the very best reports both from the Most Rev. Mgr. Janssen and from the

Very Rev. Mgr. Mignot. After three years of faithful work we may consider Chinchuba as a firmly-established institution with ever-increasing opportunities for good in behalf of the Deaf-Mutes.

P. M. A.

PRIESTS AND WORKINGMEN ON ABSTINENCE DAYS.

Qu. Are priests allowed the use of flesh meat on days of abstinence not excepted by the late Indult "*Circa dispensationem ab abstinentia favore operariorum in Statibus Foederatis Americae?*" [1]

Resp. Priests are allowed the use of flesh meat on days of abstinence (except Fridays, Ash Wednesday, Holy Week and the Vigil of Christmas), *if they belong to the laboring class.* (1 Cor. xv, 10.)

CONFERENCE CASES.

A number of important and interesting questions belonging to the Conference Department have to be deferred for want of space.

The questions regarding the morality of hypnotism, etc., have already been fully answered in past numbers of the REVIEW. See Vols. II, p. 311; III, p. 257; XI, p. 461; XII, pp. 25 and 120. The same must be said in reply to other inquiries which we cannot answer in detail, but for which the semi-annual Index or the complete Index of the first ten volumes of the REVIEW may be consulted with advantage.

1 Mart. 15, 1895.

BOOK REVIEW.

QUESTIONS ON VOCATIONS. A Catechism Principally for Parochial Schools, Academies and Colleges. By a Priest of the Congregation of the Mission.—With an Appendix on "How Parishes May Establish Scholarships."—New York: P. J. Kenedy. 16 mo. Pp. 119 and 15. Pr. 30 cts.

The utilitarian spirit of our time fosters wrong views about certain states of life which involve grave responsibilities. Marriages are entered into from considerations of wealth, of social position, of being provided for, or as the result of whimsical affection which cannot withstand the trials and changes of earthly life.

In the religious life we frequently find that the actual motives prompting those who apply for admission to the ranks of the self-sacrificing spouses of Christ, are the desire to shirk the hopeless tasks of secular life, to find a home, to enjoy a certain respectability usually accorded to religious; but not to work, to renounce themselves, to be humbled for Christ's sake, and to lose their lives for the purpose of gaining them.

As to the most exalted vocation of the priesthood, every thoughtful superior of our Ecclesiastical seminaries, and many a keen-sighted and disinterested pastor can bear witness to the attempts constantly made on the part of students and their parents, to enter the sacred priesthood without call or equipment. Love of a certain respectability, the prospect of a good living, the passive indolence of those who are pushed through the seminary course by their friends, the error of those who, having entered the seminary with a doubtful vocation, afterward lack the moral courage to give up because it disappoints their relatives and acquaintances—these motives are more common than we are usually disposed to admit either to ourselves or to others, among those who wear the garb of the cleric.

All this arises largely from a want of realizing that these different states of life demand a special vocation, and that they entail most serious obligations which cannot be properly performed by those who assume the responsibility with a mistaken view as to their ability and their grace.

For this reason we must welcome any book which will aid the boy or girl in discerning the spirit which prompts the choice of one or other of these responsible states of life. Fr. Downing's catechism puts the matter in form of question and answer, with apt illustrations to render his statements more clear. No one can fail to derive much advantage from a right use of this little text-book, which, in the hands of good teachers, is likely to foster true vocations, and thus enrich the harvest for heaven, which is being scattered in many places through careless or unskilled laborers in the field of the Church.

HISTORY OF THE MONETARY LEGISLATION and of the Currency System of the United States. Embracing rare and valuable documents. By the Hon. Rob. E. Preston, to which is added a speech on "Our Currency System" by the Hon. James H. Eckels, Comptroller of Currency.—John J. McVey, Philadelphia, 1896. Pp. 128. Price, 25 cts.

This brochure forms a valuable contribution to the literature of its special subject, and deserves the attention of students of social and political economy. "Above all," says Mr. Preston, "it is certain that any scheme for the reform of our currency which does not contemplate the continued suspension of the coinage of full legal-tender silver, except by virtue of an international agreement, and, perhaps, at an altered ratio, would prove abortive." Among the documents contained in this review of the subject, we have Robert Morris on a Coinage Scheme for the United States; Thomas Jefferson's Notes on a Money Unit; Alexander Hamilton's Report on the Establishment of a Mint, and John Sherman's views of the Part which Silver Should Play in Our Currency System.

HISTORY OF THE JEWISH NATION after the destruction of Jerusalem under Titus. By the Rev. Alfred Edersheim, M.A., D.D., Ph.D. Revised by the Rev. Henry A. White, M.A. Oxon. With a Preface by the Rev. William Sanday, D.D, LL.D.—Longmans, Green & Co., London, New York and Bombay, 1896.

It is just forty years ago since Prof. Edersheim, then a minister of the Scottish Free Church at Old Aberdeen, published the first

edition of this volume, which was shortly afterward reprinted. At the time of its appearance it had a particular significance. The author, yet in the prime of his manhood and ministerial career, had been converted to Christianity from Judaism about ten years before, when only twenty years of age. All his natural sympathies were with the Jewish race, while his studies and subsequent convictions had brought him to recognize the fulfilment of the Messianic prophecies in the religion of Christ. "For many years," he wrote at that time, "have I cherished the desire of writing the History of the Jewish nation." It was with him a self-imposed task of love, while there was also a special need of such a work to aid the student of Hermeneutics in the proper understanding, no less of the New Testament Books than of the Old Law. "A simple and impartial account of Judaism on the one hand, and a perusal of the Gopsels on the other, constitute one of the most convincing proofs of the divine origin of the Christian religion . . . If a copy of the Gospels were put into the hands of an impartial Jewish historian, he could not fail to discover that the events there chronicled must have taken place exactly at the time when, according to Christian belief, Jesus walked among men. The Gospels, historically speaking, cannot be an after-production." (Author's Pref.)

The tone of deep conviction which breathes from every page of Edersheim's writings, to his last days, shows that he is not a mere recorder of historic facts or descriptive incident, but a sincere apologist of that divine economy of salvation which makes the Jewish dispensation the legitimate antecedent of the Christian religion. If he contrasts the formalism and literalism of the Synagogue teaching with the spiritual tendency which the doctrinal development of the New Testament shows to have been its destined purpose, he is, nevertheless, wholly free from anti-semitic bias, although he has been accused of such by his Jewish brethren. Indeed, to our mind he takes far too lenient a view of the Talmudic doctrines, when in the second edition of his "Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," published many years later, he states that "it is entirely false to regard anything in Talmudic writings about the 'Gentiles' as applying to Christians," or that the Talmudic sayings are not the criterion and rule of duty with the orthodox Jews of modern times.

With regard to the Catholic Church, it is to be regretted that he could not view her in a more just light than his position in the communion to which he gave his undivided religious adherence war-

ranted. Though he was disposed, as he said, not to judge the moral principles of Roman Catholics "by prurient quotations from the Casuists," yet he considered the ancient Mother Church as having apostatized, and in this spirit conceived his elaborate "Warburton Lectures" on *Prophecy and History in relation to the Messiah.*

Apart from this point of view, which hardly affects the present *History of the Jewish Nation* as a source of exact information, Edersheim's work has lost little of its former importance. We have, it is true, other valuable contributions to the literature of this subject, written within more recent times, but they do not occupy precisely the same position or have the same purpose. Dr. Schürer's *History of the Jewish People*, which is a standard work dealing with the same matter, and of much more recent date, does not in any way trespass upon Edersheim's domain. The two works rather complement each other, the one drawing illustrations from Greek and Roman sources, the other from those of Rabbinical lore. And that which might have been wanting to a complete survey of the subject in view of researches made since the present volume was first issued, has been supplied, partly from Dr. Edersheim's own later publications, and partly from other equally reliable founts through the exertion of the present editor, who has availed himself of critical editions of the Mishna (Strack), correct translations of the Talmud and Midrashim (Wünsche), and other important works, such as Schürer, already mentioned, Grätz, Weber, Zung and Bacher.

For the student of the Bible, as well in its historic as in its religious aspect, the work of Edersheim, as prepared by Mr. White, is of immeasurable value, since it deals with every phase of Jewish life and history at the time of our Lord.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

CODEX S. CATHOLICAE ROMANAE ECCLESIAE quem, adnotationibus illustratum, exponit in Pontificio Seminario Vaticano, D.D. **HENRICUS MARIA PEZZANI,** S. Th. et Jur. Can. Doct. etc. Pars Altera.—Romae. 1896. Henrici Filiziani, Bipliop. et Edit. Ephem. "La Vera Roma." Pozzo delle Cornacchie, 7 e 8. (Pr. pro utraque parte, 4 volumina, 18 francs, post free.

THE MOST HIGH. A Lyrical Thought Sequence. By the author of "Wreaths of Song from Courses of Philosophy."—Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1896.

CALENDARIUM COLLEGII OMNIUM SANCTORUM, apud Dublinium, in annum MDCCCXCVI.—Dublin: All Hallows College. Printed by Browne & Nolan.) 1896.

SADLIERS' CATHOLIC DIRECTORY, Almanac and Clergy List—Quarterly. For the Year of Our Lord 1896; with full official reports of all Dioceses, Vicariates, Prefectures, etc., in the United States, Canada and Newfoundland, and the Prefecture Apostolic of St. Pierre and Miquelon Islands. Sixty-fourth annual publication. No. 1.—New York: D. & J. Sadlier & Co., 33 Barclay street.

HELPING THE HOLY SOULS by honoring their holy bodies. Sermon by the Rev. Joseph H. McMahon, A.M Published by request.—New York: The Cathedral Library Association. 1896.

THE OUTLAW OF CAMARGUE. By A. De Lamothe.—New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 12mo. Pr. bd. $1.25.

QUESTIONS OF HONOR in the Christian Life. By Katharine E. Conway. (Third Vol. of "The Family Sitting-room Series."—Boston: The Pilot Publishing Co. 1896. Pr. bd. 50 cents.

MAYNOOTH COLLEGE. Its Centenary History. By the Most Rev. John Healy, D.D., LLD., M.R.I.A. Bishop of Macra and Coadjutor Bishop of Clonfert, etc., etc.—Dublin: Browne & Nolan. (New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Bros.) 1895.

A FEW PLAIN THOUGHTS upon the Anglican Movement. By Fr. H. Reginald Buckler, O.P.—Woodchester: "Rosary" Press.—London: Burns & Oates. 1896. Pp. 69.

LYRA HIERATICA. Poems on the Priesthood. Collected from many sources. By the Rev. T. E. Bridgett, C.SS.R.—London: Burns & Oates. (New York, Chicago and Cincinnati: Benziger Bros.)

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND DISCIPLINE, simply explained by Philip Bold. Revised and in part edited by Father Eyre, S.J.—London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. 1896. (Benziger Bros.)

DE L'UNION DES EGLISES. Réponse à la Lettre Encyclique du Patriarche Grec de Constantinople. Par le P. S. Brandi, S.J. Traduit de l'Italien.—Rome: Imprimerie du Vatican. 1896.

EVANGELIUM SECUNDUM LUCAM. Commentar. in Nov. Testam. Auctore Jos. Knabenbauer, S.J. Cursus Scripturae Sacrae. Vol. XXII. —Parisiis: P. Lethielleux. 1896. Pp. 653.

HISTORY OF THE JEWISH NATION after the destruction of Jerusalem under Titus. By the Rev. Alfred Edersheim, M.A., D.D., Ph.D. Revised by the Rev. Henry A. White, M.A., Oxon., with a Preface by the Rev. William Sanday, D.D., LL.D. Longmans, Green & Co.—London, New York and Bombay. 1896. Pp. xiv, 553. Pr. $5.00.